LIBRARY
STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
JOHNSON CITY, TENNESSEE

The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXVIII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 28, 1934 NUMBER 1004

Contents

The Week 57

Editorials

The Meaning of Austria 60
Control—or Excuses? 61
The Chicago Epidemic 62

General Articles

The Marxian Dialectic: A Reply..Herman Simpson 63
Lady Unemployed 67
New Homes for a New Deal.....Lewis Mumford 69
Washington Notes .....T. R. B. 72
Other People's Money.....John T. Flynn 73
Labor and the N. R. A. 74
Preachment Against Puritans.....Paul Rosenfeld 75
Sagebrush (verse).....John Gould Fletcher 75
A Communication.....Hugh S. Johnson 76

Correspondence 77

Faith and Tosh.....Stark Young 78

Books in Review

Santayana's Orthodoxy.....John Dewey 79
Novels as News.....T. S. Matthews 80
Helen Keller's Other Self.....Martha Gruening 81
Economics Without Recovery....W. Bayard Taylor 82
The Sins of the Statesmen.....Robert Morss Lovett 83
Books in Brief 84

The Week

CHANCELLOR Dollfuss, in his radio broadcast to the American people, misrepresented what had taken place and gave false assurances for the future. He said, first, that the civil war in Austria was an attack upon the government, when according to every reliable witness it was an attack by the government and the Heimwehr on the Socialists and their party, which had been doing its best to coöperate with him in defense of the republic against the Nazis. Second, he stated that the fighting on the part of the Socialists was carried on merely by a small group of fanatics, that the working class as a whole was not against him, and that this was proved by the lack of an effective general strike. The answer is that the only workers who could fight were the remnants of the Socialist Schutzbund, which had been deprived of most of its weapons. The aggression of Dollfuss was so sudden that no effective general strike could be called. The Socialist leaders strove to avert hostilities to the end, and so could not prepare for unanimous resistance. Dollfuss almost certainly underestimated the number of killed and wounded; the true total will probably never be known. His promise of future protection for labor organizations and workers "who feel nationally" and will coöperate with him, naturally implies the doom of the main part of the Austrian labor movement—the Socialist. And even if he meant his promise sincerely, he has now lost the power to carry it out. He is in the power of the irreconcilable leaders of the Heimwehr—Fey and Starhemberg—who are reactionary fascists and are bent on wiping out every vestige of an authentic and independent workers' organization.

THE present investigation by Congress into army airplane and motorized-equipment contracts should be extended to the affairs of the Navy. Senator Nye's resolution, calling for a probe into the whole munitions business, ought to be passed. The Vinson naval bill, scheduled to come before the Senate this week, constitutes the most indefensible naval grab in this country's history. The original bill authorized construction of an airplane carrier, sixty-five destroyers and thirty submarines—all this in addition to six 10,000-ton cruisers authorized, but not laid down, last spring. Amendments have now been added to the Vinson bill to permit the building of seven 35,000-ton battleships upon the expiration of the Washington and London naval treaties next year, and to give authority to the Navy Department to order an unlimited number of seaplanes. Serious accusations of collusive bidding were made last spring at the time of the letting of contracts for the 10,000-ton cruisers built from P.W.A. funds. It is urgent that an investigation into these charges be made before the Senate consents to vote on the Vinson bill. However, even if it were sure that the government would receive honest value for every dollar spent, the Vinson bill would still be thoroughly bad. The most important argument of the bill's proponents is that it is needed by United States negotiators at the forthcoming world naval conference in order to bludgeon concessions from England and Japan. The certain fact is that the Vinson bill, if permitted to pass, will be used by ex-admirals in England and navy clansmen in Japan to inflame opinion in those countries to a point where neither the English nor Japanese governments, next year, will dare make any concessions whatever. Its passage will doom the 1935 naval conference to futility.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MEN seem to be biting dogs rather frequently these days. It certainly is news when a report from the Russell Sage Foundation advocates, not merely the socialization of the coal industry, but the socialization of the whole industrial system. Nevertheless Miss Mary Van Kleeck, director of the Department of Industrial Studies of that Foundation, does this in a forthcoming report, "The Problem of Coal in the United States—a Record of Failure and a Forecast of the Solution," which is the result of fifteen intensive years of study. The report shows that the industry "has for fifty years caused continuous and widespread unemployment, waste of an indispensable and non-restorable national resource, and discrimination against the household consumer in favor of the steel industry, public utilities and other large industrial buyers." It tells how investigation after investigation has revealed the same evils, how nothing effective has ever been done about them, and why this inaction has resulted from the capitalist organization of society. Says the report:

> The reason for the inability of the government to act effectively in this industry is to be found in the economic conflicts between separate owners and in the cross-conflict between miners and management. As a result, the community or the state becomes a house divided against itself. The government, which is merely one function of the community, is not a supreme power able to hold the scales of justice in favor of greater efficiency or social righteousness, but must on the contrary be dominated by the strongest power among the conflicting interests which make up the community.

NO ONE challenges the appraisal of facts regarding the coal industry; the point, according to the Russell Sage report, is to inquire "why, when these facts have been known for so many years, no effective action has been taken by the nation?"

> It is significant that, among the principal coal-producing countries—the United States, Great Britain, Germany and the Union of Socialist Soviet Republics—only in the Soviet Union, where both economic institutions and governmental institutions have been simultaneously changed, has nationalization of mines been achieved. In the Soviet Union, coal is socialized, as are all other natural resources and means of production, and the coal industry is planned as an element in the total planned economy.

Nationalization of the coal industry alone, Miss Van Kleeck thinks, would be undesirable because at present it would be impossible to plan the interrelationships to other industries, still privately owned, and our existing government is not adapted to the administration of industry. The adoption of a new system must rest on the power and aims of the workers and other producers. As next steps toward the necessary solution, the report urges (1) unemployment funds for miners, (2) freedom for workers' organizations, since "the union can protect the workers' rights only if there be unimpaired and undiscouraged right collectively to withhold their labor," (3) workers' education and coöperation of all workers, industrial, technical and scientific, in study of the economic problems facing the nation—a task for which it is most important to maintain "the constitutional rights of free assembly and free speech, since education will largely take the form of discussion of current problems and conditions," and (4) education of the general public to the end that "a constantly widening circle will throw their influence toward the protection of human rights against property rights in the inevitable struggle of the workers for a new status, which the present crisis shows to be necessary." The report also outlines a method of scientific management for the coal industry that would be possible if, and only if, a socially planned economy should become a reality.

DID you know that President Roosevelt favors the adoption of the Child Labor Amendment? Probably not, because the newspapers have given little publicity to a letter written by him on January 25 to Mrs. La Rue Brown of Boston, Massachusetts, stating, "of course, I am in favor of the Child Labor Amendment." The letter was given to the Associated Press in Boston on February 6. It failed to appear in the New York papers on the following morning. Inquiry revealed that the A.P. did not relay it outside of New England. The story was then sent out by the National Child Labor Committee, but was either buried or not printed at all by most of the papers; in some cases personal protests were necessary to cause its publication. Of course it is a mere coincidence that most of the newspaper publishers are opposed to the Amendment, that they fought a child-labor provision in their own code. Of course it is merely a sound judgment of what constitutes news which made them feature long statements against the Amendment by Nicholas Murray Butler, ex-President Lowell of Harvard and Cardinal O'Connell, but not to see any news interest in a lively letter from the President of the United States concerning an issue of national importance. Or is The New York Daily News correct when it says editorially that the behavior of the press generally in this instance was "a darned piffling, shabby performance"?

THE great meeting of protest against Austrian fascism held in Madison Square Garden last week ended in a riot, and in one that was all the more disastrous to the radical movement because it was widely reported over the radio. The announcer, who had never before seen anything of the sort, was amazed and horrified; so was the public at large. Who bears the blame for this fiasco? The Communists must accept the larger part of it. They were not invited to this meeting organized by the Socialists and by several labor unions, yet they came to it in force, bearing banners attacking the Socialist leaders. They wanted a united front with the Socialists, and they yelled and shrieked for it so loudly that none of the Socialist speakers could be heard. They were exasperated by the fact that Matthew

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Woll, the reactionary labor leader who spends his time attacking the Soviet Union, had been invited to address the meeting, while all Communist speakers had been excluded. Some of their own leaders tried to quiet them. Clarence Hathaway, editor of the Communist Daily Worker, advanced to the platform—"to propose to the chairman," he said in a statement issued the same evening, "that I be permitted to make a one-minute appeal for perfect order in the meeting. The chairman, without a word of answer, struck me a heavy blow in the face." The Socialists give a different account of this incident, but it is certain in any case that scores of them attacked Hathaway and beat him on the head with fists and chairs until he was covered with blood. Fights sprang up all over the vast hall, while the police stood by, their hands itching for the nightsticks which they had been told for once to leave behind. The meeting ended in chaos. All in all, it was a disgraceful performance; nobody but Hathaway came out of it with any credit. It was a great defeat for the recent movement toward unifying the work of the radical parties.

IT IS interesting news that Dr. Ernest Gruening, now one of the editors of The Nation, is to take the editorial chair of The New York Evening Post. When this paper was recently purchased by J. David Stern, publisher of The Philadelphia Record and other newspapers, and a journalist with an excellent history as a fighting liberal, The New Republic commented on the fine opportunity the New York field affords such a man. His selection of Dr. Gruening proves, as does the vigorous tone of the whole paper, that he intends to take full advantage of the chance. Dr. Gruening has had wide experience in daily journalism, and especially in his most recent position in that field, as editor of the Portland, Maine, Evening News. He has also been a vigorous and consistent critic of the sins of the commercial press. In his new post he will have the best chance of his whole career to practise what he has been preaching, in the national metropolis, with the eyes of the country's leading journalists upon him.

THE National Religion and Labor Foundation has made a thorough investigation of the circumstances attending the refusal of Northwestern University to reappoint James M. Yard as Director of Religious Activities. The reasons given by President Scott are (1) that "the experiment had failed," and (2) the need of economy. As to the first, the evidence to the contrary from faculty and students is overwhelming. A group of the former wrote:

> In two ways the service of Dr. James Yard to Northwestern University has been in our opinion invaluable. He has brought to this campus a brave and simple Christianity that has become a unique influence on students and faculty alike. . . . Dr. Yard has also brought to the campus an educational enthusiasm and enlightenment that Northwestern University can ill afford to lose. He has become the center of a large group of intellectual young men and women who are trying to face the desperate problems of these times with maturity and responsibility and to find answers for themselves.

The fact that Dr. Yard interpreted his function in individual terms, and that, to quote Dean Hibbard, "he had given no attention whatever to building up an organization that would stand by him in a crisis," is apparently the measure in the official mind of the failure of the experiment. As to the second reason, undoubtedly Northwestern, like other institutions, is hard hit in the present depression. In view of its character and traditions, however, it is hard to conceive that it would economize in the field of religious activity. If economy was the reason for not reappointing Dr. Yard, it was surely a marked instance of official meanness to throw the burden of failure upon him, especially in view of President Scott's admission that he had not given him "moral support in the development of his program."

A THIRD reason for the refusal to renew Dr. Yard's appointment occurs to everyone who knows the situation. A member of the class of 1932 wrote to The Daily Northwestern: "It is my conviction that . . . the real reason for his dismissal lay in under-cover intrigues on the part of those who oppose his candid and Christian stand on matters of war, race and industrial relations." The North Shore suburbs of Chicago have been since the War a center of reactionary movements. It was in Evanston that the notorious General Dawes organized his Minute Men of America, and since then the American Legion, the D.A.R., the Paul Reveres, Ku Klux Klan and other patriotic organizations have raged like the heathen. That their attacks on Dr. Yard had an influence on the Board of Trustees is altogether probable, even though the evidence for this view is purely circumstantial. As the correspondent of The Daily Northwestern puts it: "Gentlemen, if this be a misinterpretation, you are yourselves responsible for the general student suspicion that attends much of your activity. In the past you have not been above subserviency to the intellectually infantile pressure of the American Legion, and certain people of wealth from whom endowments have come or are likely to come." The denial by President Scott that Dr. Yard's social views had any bearing on the case will seem negligible to those who know that college presidents sometimes behave like human beings.

HELPFUL in pushing forward the movement for security for the aged is the Dill-Connery bill just reported out by the Senate Committee on Labor. The matter has been before the House for more than a year and now has a chance of going through Congress without further delay. The bill carries an appropriation of $10 million to be used as federal grants to those states that have old-age-pension systems. Certain restrictions are placed on the pay-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ments, to be sure: grants are not allowed in excess of one dollar per day per person and payment is permitted only to persons over sixty-five who have less than $5,000 worth of property. One great advantage of the bill is that it sets up no new federal machinery. It relies on such pension systems as the states now have or care to set up. This is one of the soundest forms of unemployment relief, and one that nobody ought to hesitate to support.

The Meaning of Austria

CHANCELLOR Dollfuss of Austria will go down in history as one of the arch fiends of the class war. Nothing can ever wipe out the memory of the armed attack on the workers in Vienna, Linz and other cities, the shattering with six-inch howitzers of apartments full of women and children —apartments which were models of housing and which had replaced some of the worst slums in the world. The bursting of shells fired through the large, muslin-curtained windows, gay with potted flowers, is a symbol of the hatred felt by reactionary elements for anything which, at the expense of their profits and their control over the workers' minds, aims to benefit the masses. For it should not be forgotten that Dollfuss and his Heimwehr had the financial and political support of the very landlords who had been hurt by the competition of the Socialists' municipal housing, of the employers who had to deal with the unions and pay taxes to the Socialist government of Vienna. Or that the last-minute efforts of the more moderate Christian Socialists (the Catholic party of Austria) to make common cause with the Socialists in defense of constitutional democratic government were blocked, according to Dr. Otto Bauer, the Socialist leader, by the Papal Nuncio, Monsignor Sibylla. If this is true—and there is no good reason to doubt it—the Vatican itself is stained with the blood of the workers.

Even the ignominy of Dollfuss is exceeded by his folly. He wanted, he said, to preserve Austrian independence against the menace of Nazi Germany. If this were his principal desire, he should have enlisted the support of the Socialists, who were the ultimate and irreconcilable enemies of fascism, and should have sought rather to disarm and suppress the Austrian Nazis. A combination between the Socialists, who comprised at least 35 percent of the population of Austria, and formed an overwhelming majority in Vienna, with the Christian Socialists, who were the largest party in the rural districts and in some of the provincial cities, would have made Nazi aggression impossible. But Dollfuss believed it more important to suppress the labor movement, abolish democratic government and establish his own brand of fascism than to present an invincible front against the Hitlerites.

He was not compelled to wage a civil war against the workers. All the reliable correspondents have established the fact that this was not a "revolt" by the Socialists, in the sense of armed aggression. It was a last-stand, heroic defense against the aggression of Dollfuss and the Heimwehr aimed at breaking the political and economic organizations of labor, depriving them of their weapons and executing their leaders. Doubtless the strength of their resistance surprised him, but he had ample warning that they would resist. Now he can never gain the loyalty of the working class, without which no government in Austria can live for long. Rather he has immensely strengthened the Nazis, who are making capital out of his folly and are even recruiting members from Socialist workers eager for revenge at any cost. There were many signs before the civil war that the Nazis were making inroads upon the Heimwehr itself. If Hitler had planned the downfall of Dollfuss, he could not have directed the action of the Austrian Chancellor more cleverly. And when the Nazis win Austria, the foreign influences which have been supporting Dollfuss—the governments of England, France and Italy, and the Catholic Church—will lose as completely as if they had never tried to protect him.

The reiteration by the governments of the three Western powers that they will not permit German aggression in Austria is meaningless in these circumstances and will be without effect. If Austria goes Nazi, it will do so because Dollfuss has made any other outcome impossible, and it will do so without intervention from Germany. And then Austria will be as firmly united with Germany as if Hitler had conquered it. In economic policy and in political action it will be directed from Berlin. Hitler can bide his time to announce a formal union. And if the other powers interfere, Hitler can charge them with trying to thwart the will of the Austrian people. The selfsame influences that defeated socialism in Austria handed over that country to Hitler on a silver platter.

Even supposing, by some off-chance, that Dollfuss were able to perpetuate his rule and establish a fascist dictatorship with Italian instead of with German leanings, still the danger of war would be imminent. For then we should have an Austria under the influence of Rome and directly dependent upon its support. The French hegemony of Central Europe would have been broken by Mussolini, who would certainly seize the opportunity to extend his influence still further. The Franco-Italian feud would become sharper and more menacing. The chances are that in the end Hitler would be forced to come to terms with Mussolini, and Mussolini, no longer fearing the power of a Teutonized Austria, would be willing to help Hitler against France, Czechoslovakia and her remaining allies, as well as against Russia. From the point of view both of labor and of international peace, one brand of fascism is as bad as another.

Thus, in the light of longer historical view, Dollfuss seems less a personal devil and more a tool of the suicidal tendency of capitalist imperialism.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Within each country, capitalism in crisis, whatever its protestations, puts first the destruction of the labor movement and the suppression of the working class. It tries to divert the workers from the effort to construct a new economic and social order, and tie them to its chariot by nationalistic and imperialist slogans. Then it is ready to push the quarrel of nation with nation. It disclaims any intention to seek the solution of its difficulties by war, meanwhile building up its armaments, preparing the people's minds for hostilities, and pursuing policies that lead directly to irreconcilable clashes.

The meaning of the Austrian tragedy, beneath all the surface complications, emerges. It is but a step in the preparation of a new European holocaust, in which the workers, having been defeated at home and absorbed into capitalist states, will be set murdering one another across national boundaries. The only true force of internationalism is an independent workers' movement strong enough to build and maintain international socialism. If, when such a movement is threatened within a nation, it does not carry out a victorious fight against its oppressors, the workers will eventually be compelled to fight their brothers in other lands. In a world made dark by gathering clouds, the heroic defense of the Austrian workers, men and women alike, was a flash of brilliant light—though it came too late. They were fighting not only in their own behalf but in behalf of workers everywhere, in behalf of humanity, peace and economic order, against greed, hatred and superstition. Their courage should inspire the workers in other lands which have not yet succumbed to reaction to build and maintain their strength, to close their ranks against pointless internal dissension, and to resist dissolution of their organizations to the last. Battles may be lost, but the war must be won, if civilization is to endure.

Control—or Excuses?

THE New York Stock Exchange is leading the fight against adequate government regulation. Richard Whitney, its president, and his associates insist that they can regulate operations on stock exchanges sufficiently well so that government participation in those regulatory efforts is unnecessary. This raises the question, to quote Mr. Whitney's remarks in a nationwide radio broadcast some time ago, whether the New York Stock Exchange has performed its function "honestly and efficiently."

One of the principal obligations of the Exchange is to protect the public against misuse of the Stock Exchange in the admission to trading of questionable or worthless stock. It is precisely this matter that the testimony before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee is now bringing to light. There is, for instance, the story of the listing of additional shares of the American Commercial Alcohol Company while a pool was running the price up from $20 to $89 and subsequently letting it drop back to $29. Officially the Exchange was not aware that a pool was operating. It was simply asked to admit to trading new stock of the Alcohol Company issued against the acquisition of a new property, Noxon, Inc., itself a dummy of the directors of the Alcohol Company.

The official duty of the Committee on Stock List is to investigate all such applications, to see that the new stock is issued for an honest and proper purpose and is free of fraud. Such, it develops, was not the case with the increase in American Commercial Alcohol stock; it was improperly issued and actually served only the private purposes of the chief officers of the company, who were running the pool. How did it happen that the Committee on Stock List and the Governing Committee both were unable to perceive this at the time of listing?

Mr. Frank Altschul, a member of the Board of Governors of the Exchange, chairman of its Committee on Stock List, has undertaken to explain these unfortunate circumstances to the Senate Committee. He admitted that if the balance sheet of the dummy, Noxon, Inc., had been before the Committee their suspicions would have been aroused and the listing application would have been denied; for the listing application stated some items of the assets as worth $700,000 where the balance sheet more modestly and truthfully carried them as worth only $350,000. (A mere 100-percent write-up on the public statement.)

But, said Mr. Altschul, no member of the Stock List Committee and no member of the Governing Committee of the Exchange saw that balance sheet at the time they were considering whether to grant the application for the listing of the stock. The balance sheet, he said, "was not available."

Mr. Altschul's Committee seems to have been sufficiently careless to have listed the stock without looking at the "unavailable" balance sheet. As a matter of fact the dereliction of the Exchange authorities was worse. In the files of the Stock Exchange that very balance sheet now reposes stamped on the back with a date and hour previous to the granting of the listing application. A "clerical error," Mr. Altschul explained. Further the Governing Committee had to pass on the application and did so two days after the balance sheet was in the possession of the Exchange. The Governing Committee, Mr. Altschul said, considers only the printer's proofs of documents. The printer's proof of the balance sheet is likewise in the files of the Exchange stamped with a date and hour previous to the Committee's authorization of the increase. This Mr. Altschul likewise explained: "A cog slipped somewhere."

Undoubtedly. But why should all the cogs slip in one direction? Neither Committee of the Exchange ever saw the one document without which they could not possibly form an intelligent judgment on the listing application although that docu-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment was in their possession. Mr. Altschul himself never saw the balance sheet, knew nothing of the 100-percent write-up, although that balance sheet appeared in the printed reports of the Exchange sent to every member.

There is other testimony before the Senate Committee which only adds to this picture. The listing of stock of the General Theatres Equipment, for instance, resulted in the loss of millions to investors. In this case, Mr. Altschul explained, the Exchange was "deceived." So too, he said, it was "deceived" into permitting the listing of Kreuger and Toll.

Mr. Richard Whitney has said that the New York Stock Exchange has the most thorough and searching listing requirements of any Exchange in the world. Even if that were true, which it is not, would it matter when the men who enforce these requirements cannot keep clear of "clerical errors," "slipping cogs," and are as easily "deceived" as babes of five (though always in the same direction)?

And these are the same men who are now before the nation insisting that regulation of the stock exchanges be left with them, that they alone are sufficiently trained and sufficiently competent to take care of the interests of millions of investors.

The Chicago Epidemic

CHICAGO is proud of its fire, its fair and its epidemic. Mr. James O'Donnell Bennett, the leading special writer of The Chicago Tribune, euthyrambically describes the operations of the Health Department against amebic dysentery, which appeared last July, as "a romance of a nationwide peacetime victory over a deadly enemy." It was a victory for Chicago in that the situation was successfully concealed from the country until after the Fair had closed. The Chicago newspapers, which failed to print the facts until too late, assert that they knew nothing about the epidemic. What are newspapers for? Now that they do know they become accomplices after the fact in upholding the city administration, with the exception of The Daily Times. That paper has unearthed the fact that seven people died of amebic dysentery at the County Hospital between July 22 and November 24. So strict was the quarantine on news that the authorities of the County Hospital received no communication directing their attention to the prevalence of the disease until November 9. The Chicago Medical Society guardedly lays the blame for this failure on the part of Mayor Kelly: "Future candidates for mayor should have this disastrous example of lack of coöperation between the Commissioner of Health and the city physicians brought to their attention." Dr. Bundesen, chairman of the Board of Health, says of the mayor, "His attitude was magnificent."

Meanwhile people who had visited Chicago were taken ill in other parts of the country and, owing to the failure of physicians to recognize this rare disease, some of them died, among them Texas Guinan, who was operated on for appendicitis at Vancouver. On August 16, Dr. Bundesen became aware of the situation, and located the chief source of infection in the Congress Hotel, but kept his secret. In the middle of October at a meeting of the American Public Health Association in Indianapolis a physician reported that he had seen nine cases of amebic dysentery in one town, all among visitors to the Fair. The Tribune naïvely remarks, "This was the first intimation to the Chicago Board of Health that persons outside Chicago had been infected." Apparently they assumed that non-residents were immune. Then Dr. Bundesen sent out a questionnaire, carefully disguised as to its purpose, to all guests of the Congress Hotel since June 1. This brought to light 653 cases in 185 cities, 35 of which had proved fatal. To warn attending physicians, 1,500 telephone calls were made at a total cost of between $20,000 and $30,000 (figures from The Chicago Tribune's laudatory article.) Only on November 9 when the Fair was about to close did Dr. Bundesen bethink himself of the radio, and broadcast himself in the role of hero.

The American Medical Journal of February 3 compliments Dr. Bundesen on the ground that without his action "the outbreak might not have been recognized and traced to Chicago." This is the usual bunk, as the testimony of the Indiana physician shows the trouble was bound to be traced to Chicago, and Dr. Bundesen waited until the last moment before admitting it. On the other hand, the Chicago Medical Society, before which Dr. Bundesen appeared and shouted forth the credit for this victory, passed resolutions condemning him in terms that stop short of the ugly word murder: "Had physicians been informed through a confidential letter of the presence of the disease at the outset, three months would have been saved in getting control of the disease; treatment would have been started earlier, and *lives would have been saved. The embarrassment that Chicago is suffering may be laid at the door of negligence*" (italics ours).

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1934, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 421 WEST 21ST STREET, NEW YORK CITY. BRUCE BLIVEN, PRESIDENT. DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER.

EDITORS

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

H. N. BRAILSFORD JOHN DEWEY JOHN T. FLYNN
WALDO FRANK E. C. LINDEMAN LEWIS MUMFORD
GILBERT SELDES R. G. TUGWELL LEO WOLMAN

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Marxian Dialectic: A Reply

IF I INTEND to criticize an idea, I first state the idea, then I present my argument against it. Not so Max Eastman in his attack on the Marxian dialectic. His article in last week's New Republic starts, as it were, with the creation: the Greeks had a fashionable parlor game, which developed into a science of intellectual conversation. (A queer sort of science!) Then comes a dizzy leap into the Dark Ages, when the dialectic was raised to the primacy of all philosophy. And now that we are inoculated with contempt for the dialectic, we are informed that no great scientist ever had any use for the confounded thing until Marx gave it a position of honor in his "so-called scientific socialism."

How did this dreadful thing happen? It is all Hegel's fault. It seems that Hegel, for some dark purpose of his own, needed a *golem,* or automaton, which Eastman calls, in the current psychological slang, wish-fulfilling machinery. So Hegel created a *golem* that stood on two legs. One leg was the Platonic Idea, the other was the notion of development; the latter was the strong point of the *golem;* in it Hegel got the jump on science. The young Karl Marx, who must have been a good deal of a dolt, believed in this incredible thing until he was twenty-five years old, whereas a really bright young man discards the teachings of his university before he matriculates. But even when he rejected the Hegelian Idea, Marx continued to believe in a self-developing reality, and this was the source of all his errors. Why an idea that placed Hegel in advance of the science of his day should in Marx become a source of all error, remains a secret.

Having at last reached this point, we might reasonably expect to be told what was the Marxian dialectic, how Marx applied it, into what errors it led him. But that is not Eastman's way. He first exhibits one error on the part of Engels, then another error on the part of Marx, then he takes us back to Hegel, *via* Croce, then forward to Lenin, *via* the latter's notebook. From Lenin's notes Eastman concludes that Lenin, like Marx, "was driven, whether consciously or not, by some other motive than a desire to understand the world"; that "he was not engaged in scientific investigation, but in wish-fulfilment thinking"; that "he was using his mind, not in order to promote the success of his action, but in order to assure himself that his action will succeed." Nevertheless this man, devoid of intellectual integrity and habitually practising self-deception and self-hypnosis, exercised "the most brilliant political leadership, perhaps, that this world has seen." Here is another secret.

And now at last Eastman takes us back to Marx and his errors. He tells us that, according to Marx, "the general course of history is determined, not by the nature of man, but by the nature of things." He misunderstands and misquotes Marx to this effect. Then he enumerates Marx's fundamental errors, namely, the theories of economic determinism, of the origin of classes and the role of class struggles, and of the dictatorship of the proletariat which leads up to communism. Thus Eastman's assault, ostensibly directed against the Marxian dialectic, ends in a complete Marxian massacre. All the sociological, economic and political theories of Marx are rejected without even an attempt at refutation or criticism. Eastman also rejects historical determinism in general, even in its pre- or un-Marxian form, so that if we wish to understand history we must go back to chance, or Providence, or fate, or the great man. But why wish to understand it? The main thing is to have a plan of social engineering. This is the beginning and the end of all social wisdom.

Eastman-Thersites

I shall not attempt to follow Eastman in all his windings and turnings. Given a sufficient amount of confusion, it is easier to raise up difficulties in ten lines than to resolve them in as many pages. But it is necessary to glance at some of the points he makes, even though they have no direct bearing on the main question, in order to get an idea of his method of presentation.

With the Greeks, he tells us, the dialectic was a fashionable parlor game. I open Windelband's "History of Philosophy":

> The observation that everything in the world is in process of constant change, was exaggerated by Heraclitus to the claim that everything is continually changing into its opposite. The "other" was for him *eo ipso* the opposed. The "flux" of things became transformed in his poetic rhetoric into a ceaseless strife of opposites, and this strife he declared to be the father of things. All that seems to be for a shorter or longer time is the product of opposed motions and forces, which in their operation maintain themselves in equilibrium.

Even in Windelband's critical presentation of them, these ideas of the old Greek thinker sound like leading motifs in an overture to modern science—action and reaction, a resultant equilibrium, universal transformation, Darwin's struggle for existence, Marx's struggle of classes, and of course, the dialectic. To speak with contempt of these premonitions of genius, one must be by nature a Thersites—Shakespeare's Thersites, not Homer's—who railed at the heroes and mocked their foibles and vices, but was completely blind to their heroic qualities.

Of the schoolmen of the Dark Ages I know even

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

less than of Heraclitus the Obscure, and leave them to Eastman to do with as he wills. But not Hegel; no doubt, his Absolute Idea is repellent, but he is redeemed by his genius and encyclopedic erudition. The mystic shell of his thought often hides a sound kernel of weighty truth. I open his "Philosophy of History" at random: "It is only an inference from the history of the world that its development has been a rational process. . . ."

To say that the confused and bloody history of mankind has been a rational process, sounds like an absurdity. But we must know what Hegel means by "rational process": "The movement of the solar system takes place according to unchangeable laws. *These laws are reason, implicit in the phenomena in question.*" So that when Hegel says: Human history is a rational process, he means that it proceeds according to the laws implicit in society. There is determinism in history as well as in nature. Like nature, history can be studied scientifically.

Many years after they had rejected Hegelianism, Marx spoke of Hegel as "that mighty thinker," while Engels characterized him as an "Olympian Zeus." But Thersites-Eastman can see only his weaknesses. Imagine a history of science that followed Eastman's method! In such a history, stress would be laid on Kepler's belief in astrology and on Newton's commentary to the New Testament, and not on their epoch-making scientific discoveries.

Historical Determinism

Eastman rejects not only Marx's theory of *economic* determinism. He also rejects the very conception of *historical* determinism. He imagines that he is thus rejecting Marxism, or the dialectic. He is grossly mistaken. He is rejecting a most important element in the intellectual progress of the past two centuries. The idea that history is subject to natural law did not originate with Marx, or even with Hegel. Let me cite some contemporaries of Marx, not one of whom can be charged with leanings toward communism.

The cautious John Stuart Mill writes in his "Logic":

> The longer our species lasts, and the more civilized it becomes, the more, as Comte remarks, does the influence of past generations over the present, and of mankind *en masse* over every individual in it, predominate over other forces; and though the course of affairs never ceases to be susceptible of alteration both by accidents and by personal qualities, the increasing preponderance of the collective agency of the species over all minor causes, is constantly bringing the general evolution of the race into something *which deviates less from a certain and preappointed track.*

Henry Thomas Buckle, in his "History of Civilization in England," goes further than Mill; he seeks for the natural laws governing human action:

> Rejecting the metaphysical dogma of free will, and the theological dogma of predestined events, we are driven to the conclusion that the actions of men, being determined solely by their antecedents, must have a character of uniformity, that is to say, must, under precisely the same circumstances, always issue in precisely the same results. . . . We have man modifying nature, and nature modifying man; while out of this reciprocal modification all events must necessarily spring. The problem immediately before us is *to ascertain the method of discovering the laws of this double modification.*

Mill and Buckle were primarily social scientists. John William Draper was primarily a natural scientist: physicist, chemist, physiologist. But he was also a student of society. His "Intellectual Development of Europe" gained him international fame. He opens that book with the queries:

> Does the procession of nations in time, like the erratic phantasm of a dream, go forward without reason or order? Or is there a predetermined, a solemn march, in which all must join, ever moving, ever resistlessly advancing, encountering and enduring an inevitable succession of events? . . .
>
> It is of law that I am to speak in this book. In a world composed of vanishing forms I am to vindicate the imperishability, the majesty of law, and to show how man proceeds, in his social march, in obedience to it.

The search for law, necessity, uniformity, in human events can be traced throughout the eighteenth century, in such men as Herder, Montesquieu, Vico, possibly even back to Spinoza. And of course, ever since the seventeenth century, the economists of France and England were engaged in establishing a theoretical system of uniformities, coëxistent and sequent, in one special department of human affairs.

The conception of a social-historical determinism is no peculiar possession of Marxism; it is the basic conception of all social science. It includes not only explanation of the past, but also prediction of the future. And Eastman rejects it in the name of science!

Errors of Marx and Engels

Readers of "Penguin Island" will recall that the chief of the general staff did not relish the idea of piling up evidence against Captain Dreyfus. No proofs are the best proofs, he said; no proofs cannot be disproved. Eastman has taken this advice to heart. In repudiating Marxism as a whole, he presents no argument, which is the strongest of all arguments, since it cannot be refuted. When he assures us that the framework—meaning the theory—of "Capital" consists of loose thinking, one may indeed marvel at the assurance, but how can one answer it? But he is careless enough to point out two specific errors on the part of Marx and one on the part of Engels, and unfortunately for him these can be looked into.

First error: Marx says that proletariat and wealth (private property) are opposites, and that in course of the conflict between these opposites, the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

proletariat itself disappears no less than its conditioning opposite, private property. Eastman is outraged: "To declare that proletariat and wealth are opposites is such loose thinking" . . . that its purpose can be no other than "to make possible the 'historic necessity' of a social revolution."

Anyone familiar with the evolution of Marx's ideas will note at a glance that the above quotation is from one of his early works: capital is not yet differentiated from wealth. In the "Communist Manifesto" the opposition is formulated, sociologically, as between bourgeoisie and proletariat, and economically, as between capital and wage labor. In fact, the quotation is from "The Holy Family" (not a book of devotion, if you please), written in 1844, while Marx's ideas were still in process of fermentation. (The years 1842-46 were for Marx an era of intellectual transition, from philosophy to science.) Marx is writing under the influence of Feuerbach's humanism. Private property, he says, cannot exist without a dehumanized proletariat; but the proletariat, conscious of its degraded condition, cannot abolish that condition without abolishing private property. The terminology is certainly un-Marxian, but the essential idea is Marxian: To emancipate itself, to cease to be a proletariat, the proletariat must abolish capital. What loose thinking there is in opposing proletariat and wealth, is another of Eastman's secrets. Those who own wealth are not proletarians, and proletarians have no wealth. What "wealth" some proletarians may have saved before 1929 has by this time completely vanished. Isn't that plain?

Second error: Eastman quotes Marx: "Man makes his own history, but he does not make it out of conditions chosen by himself, but out of such things as he finds at hand. . . . "

In this context, "things" can only signify: the physical environment external to man. And Eastman, tilting against historical determinism, comments as follows: "Men make their own history, but they are also capable, in the person of the Marxist, of knowing the inevitable outcome of that making. And this is because the general course of history is determined not by the nature of man, but by the nature of things." A cruder misquotation and misinterpretation I have rarely come across.

Marx says in "The Eighteenth Brumaire":

> Men make their own history, but they do not make it of their free will, under conditions chosen by themselves, but under such conditions as they find at hand, given and handed down. The tradition of all dead generations weighs like a nightmare upon the brain of the living.

And he goes on to illustrate this idea out of the revolutionary history of France. Marx is concerned here, not with the force of things external to man, the natural environment, but with the force of tradition, itself the work of man. Certainly, history is made by men in accord with their own nature—it certainly cannot be made by them in accord with the nature of some other being—but under conditions not of their choice. (And that is why Eastman's great plan of social engineering is a wild, utopian chimera.) In his complete lack of understanding of Marxism, Eastman finds himself caught in the antediluvian contradiction: nature of man—nature of things, as though there were a nature of man beyond space and time, independent of the physical and social environment.

Third error: Eastman quotes Engels as follows: "All successive historic conditions are only places of pilgrimage in the endless evolutionary progress of human society from the lower to the higher." This sounds optimistically evolutionary, and Eastman rises in righteous indignation. This time I cannot guess the source of the quotation, but I am willing to accept it as it stands, for I know how this matter of human evolution appeared to the author of the "Anti-Dühring" and "The Evolution of the Family, the State and Private Property."—Looking back over the human past, Engels saw an evolution—with many long interruptions and even regressions—from the formless horde to the organized tribe, feudalism, city-state, nation-state, empire; from self-sufficient small communities to world-commerce; from primitive agriculture and petty handicraft to the capitalistic great industry, which breaks through the barriers of nations and states, renders class division and class exploitation superfluous, and leads ultimately to the world community—communism. The driving force in the successive transformations he saw in the evolution of the instruments of production and exchange, which at one stage led to the coalescence of hordes into the tribe, at another stage broke up the tribe and gave rise to classes and class conflicts, states and wars. At one stage it did away with communal property in the land, at another stage it renders private property in land and instruments of production a barrier to the further development of the productive forces.—This transparently simple, realistic conception appears to Eastman so "mysterious" that he can account for it only by Engels' addiction to an ancient Greek "parlor game." His suspicion is thoroughly aroused: Does not this evolution proceed "toward humanly ideal ends," and is it not therefore a "soulful-consolatory apparatus"? By no means. To landlords and capitalists communism is an abomination, to be avoided even at the cost of fascism. Yet landlords and capitalists are human, and are attached to their ideals, which are lordly and capitalistic.

The Marx-Engels Dialectic

If we leave Eastman's blind guidance and go to Marx and Engels themselves, we may learn something concerning the dialectic as they conceived it.

In his early writings, during his intellectual transition period mentioned above, Marx criticized the mystifying side of the Hegelian dialectic; but to the best of my recollection he nowhere describes or defines his own conception of it. He comes nearest to doing this in the preface to the second German edition of "Capital." He quotes at length from an

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

article in a Russian review, dealing exclusively with the method of that work. I give here a few characteristic sentences in condensed form:

> The one thing which is of moment to Marx is to find the law of the phenomena he is investigating. And not only . . . within a given historical period. Of still greater moment to him is the law of their variation, of their development, of the transition from one form into another, from one series of connections into a different one. This law once discovered, he investigates in detail its effects. . . . These laws are independent of human consciousness, will and intelligence. . . . When a society passes from one stage into another, it becomes subject to other laws, and the same phenomenon (for instance, population) falls under different laws in different social orders.

Marx's comment is: This is the dialectic method. And he adds: "My dialectic method is not only different from the Hegelian, but is its direct opposite."

Marx also refers directly to the dialectic in the chapter on the rate and mass of surplus value, in the same work. He first shows that money (generally, exchange value) cannot be transformed into capital unless it has attained a certain minimum, which differs for various periods, countries and industries. He then remarks: "Here, as in natural science, is shown the correctness of the law discovered by Hegel, that merely quantitative differences beyond a certain point pass into qualitative changes." And in a footnote he shows how this law holds in chemistry. We must note this, however: Marx does not say that the required minimum for the conversion of money into capital follows from Hegel's law. No. He first establishes the fact, and then says that it is in agreement with Hegel's law. The dialectic is no magic key.

Engels has written rather extensively on the dialectic. In "Socialism, Utopian and Scientific" he describes it generally. It consists in viewing nature and man as in constant change and flux, and in constant interaction. To Newton, the celestial bodies were stable and eternal; to Linnæus, the species were immutable; nowadays we know that these are transient forms of being. The same holds true of society.

In the "Anti-Dühring," Engels goes into considerable detail. He shows the principle of contradiction in mechanical motion, in the higher mathematics. Life itself consists in a continual solution of contradictions; it is identity in change. He illustrates the conversion of quantitative into qualitative changes with examples from chemistry, economics, military history. Men thought dialectically, he says, long before Hegel formulated the laws of the dialectic.

In the essay on Feuerbach, Engels again takes up the dialectic, which he defines as follows:

> The science of the general laws of motion, whether of the external world or of human thought—two series of laws, which, identical in substance, differ in form, since the human mind can consciously apply them, while in nature, and until now largely also in history, they assert themselves unconsciously, in the form of external necessity, through an endless series of apparent fortuities.

He next tells us what "the great fundamental thought" of the dialectic is:

> The world is not to be comprehended as an aggregate of completed things, but as a complex of processes, in which the apparently stable things, no less than their mental reflections (concepts), go through a ceaseless transformation of birth and death, in which a progressive evolution asserts itself, notwithstanding all apparent fortuitousness and temporary regressions. *But it is one thing to admit this in phrase, another to apply it in detailed concreteness* in each sphere of investigation. But when we make this the starting point in investigation, then we no longer demand final solutions and eternal truths; we become aware of the necessary limitations of all knowledge, of its being conditioned by the circumstances in which it has been acquired. Nor can we be impressed by the old metaphysical and still current contradictions of true and false, good and evil, identical and different, necessary and accidental. We know that these opposites have only relative validity, that that which is now recognized as true has its hidden false side, and also that that which is now recognized as false has a true side, by virtue of which it was once regarded as true; that that which is regarded as necessary is made up entirely of fortuities, and that that which is supposed to be accidental is the form under which necessity hides itself.

We are, of course, interested above all in the application of the dialectic to history and society. This is Engels' general statement of it:

> The course of history is governed by general inner laws. Taken as a whole, and in spite of the consciously willed aims of the individuals, chance rules on the surface of things. The conflicts of countless individual wills and acts bring about in history a condition analogous to that which prevails in nature. . . . But wherever chance seems to prevail, there are always hidden inner laws, which have to be discovered. . . . History is the resultant of the conflicts of wills and acts, which are determined by passion or by reflection. . . . We must discover the motives back of the acts, and the determining forces—the historical causes—back of the motives. . . . Thus we arrive at the class struggles, the conditions and the relations of classes, the modes of production, and in the last analysis, the productive powers and the exchange relations.

This highly condensed presentation of Engels' exposition should give us a pretty clear idea of the dialectic. It is no Open Sesame, which only needs to be uttered in order to open before us the gates of knowledge. It is no original invention of Marx; Engels mentions Descartes and Spinoza, Diderot and Rousseau, as having applied it with success. Marx divested it of all idealistic elements; but every natural scientist is a materialist within his own laboratory and his own specialty; it is only when they leave their laboratory and specialty that so

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

many scientists become idealists, spiritualists, deists. And it is this materialistic dialectic which, in the hands of Marx and Engels and a few—very few indeed—of their most gifted followers, became a mighty instrument of investigation, of appraising the course of events, and hence of action.

A Tool for Giants

I would call the reader's especial attention to one sentence of Engels: "It is one thing to admit the dialectic and all it implies in phrase, it is another thing to apply it in detailed concreteness." For it seems to me that there is more to the dialectic than Marx and Engels have told us, more perhaps than many of their disciples would admit. It seems to me that one may learn all the laws of this higher logic, yet never become a dialectician, just as one may learn everything about poetry, its history and its technique, yet never really become a poet. Exceptionally great analytical power, coupled with the ability to see things whole, in their ramifications and concatenations, in action and interaction, in their causes and their effects—this power seems to be as rare as the highest poetical gifts. A few illustrations from Marx will perhaps make this clear.

Proudhon arrived at the conclusion: *La propriété c'est le vol.* And Marx replied: Theft is a violation of property, it presupposes property, therefore it cannot be an explanation of property.

The ordinary economist explains so many things by the abstract phrase: demand and supply. Marx points out that demand is conditioned by the relations of various classes and their respective economic position; by the proportion of the total wages to the total surplus value; and by the proportion of the various parts into which surplus value is split (profit, interest, ground rent, taxes, etc.). Supply, again, is conditioned by the most diverse factors in various industries, classes and countries. For example, a large corporation closes its plants when products must be sold at a loss, but a small farmer must produce the more the lower prices fall.

It is not given to everybody to see that, while capital seeks to obtain the greatest possible amount of surplus value, the methods which it necessarily employs tend to reduce the number of laborers employable by a given capital, so that the same factors which permit the raising of the degree of exploitation of labor, also reduce the number of laborers exploited. Or that the same laws which cause a growing mass of profit for the entire social capital also cause a fall in the rate of profit. Or that the mere sinking of the rate of profit includes the fact that "constant capital," and therewith the entire capital, is increasing.

Turning from economics to politics, it required an extraordinary intellect to see in 1870, as Marx saw and proclaimed, that the annexation of Alsace-Lorraine by Germany would lead to an alliance of France with Tsarism and would end in a world war. (It took more than twenty years for the alliance to be consummated, and more than forty years for the war to come.) Or to see in 1870, and again in 1882, that the next impulse to social revolution in Europe would come from Russia.

And because the dialectical faculty can achieve such marvelous insight into phenomena, it sometimes appears to me that perhaps Marx and Engels overrated the importance of the dialectic as it came to them formulated by Hegel, and that even without Hegel their theoretical and practical achievements might have been just as great. Be that as it may, in their hands the dialectic became a scientific method of highest potency. By its means they revolutionized the social sciences, where experimentation is impossible and the sheer force of thought must take its place.

HERMAN SIMPSON.

Lady Unemployed

MY LAST job, two years ago, was editing a woman's magazine at a salary of $8,000 a year. With the extra money I made ghost-writing, my income was around $12,000. Since then, I have lived on the leftovers of my prosperity—the sale of furniture, books, jewelry. In a sense, my extravagances of that period have been keeping me; for my savings had all gone into investments "to secure my future." Those which had any market value left in 1931, I sold. I suppose I have written practically every kind of copy—from a biography of a famous stage personality to an introduction to a technical book on architecture. One of my disadvantages has been my wide and rich experience. The only jobs which I have heard about these last two years have been beginners' jobs, and when I signified my willingness to take a beginner's job at beginner's salary, people have been afraid to give it to me. The result has been that I haven't had any jobs at all.

Long ago, I started a rigorous economizing. It is amazing how quickly one who has never gone without can learn to do so. Formerly, I seldom missed a play or concert; now I do not go near the theatre or music hall (unless taken). I have no telephone. I thought at first that would be unbearable, but I got accustomed to it, and my friends quickly adapted themselves to "dropping in." The chores which I believed would come hardest, I find myself doing quite cheerfully. I wash my own sheets and towels in the bathtub, and don't mind very much.

I stopped taking milk regularly, and took no cream at all. I cut down on meals. I no longer have meat and salad—I have the salad for another meal. The next item is cigarettes. I stopped buying them, and bought instead a tin of tobacco and some cigarette papers. I find that I can roll them if I take my time. I don't smoke so many a day, and that, I have been told, is better for one's nerves. And let me tell you, when you have at last rolled one, you appreciate it.

But these are the obvious economies—these do

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not really hurt. One day you wake up and find you cannot feed your cat any longer. If you think feeding a Silver Persian when you are on rations yourself is no problem, you just don't know anything about it. You can subsist on bread and cheese and black coffee for weeks and grow not to mind, but Kitty can't. Kitty must have fish and meat, and you can't even buy milk (which Kitty hates anyway). You may not mind disciplining yourself, but you won't do it to Kitty—at least, I won't.

So what do you do? You appear one day at the house of a slightly astonished friend, cat in tow, and inform her that you are going to leave Kitty with her for a while. She really doesn't want Kitty, but you know she is kind to animals on principle. You tell her that from among all your friends you have selected her as the most worthy of this trust. She is visibly affected by your faith, but she really doesn't know how to take care of such a superior animal. You assure her you'll give her a book that tells all about it. In fact, you could give a course on the subject yourself, and you proceed to do so. You have taken her by surprise, and she hasn't thought up a good reason for refusing.

Nor is this the extent of your duplicity. You develop more as the need grows greater. You go to a friend's house and exclaim over the tea. "Yum, this is good tea. Give me some to take home, will you. I don't want to buy a lot of it right now." A bit of tea goes a long way. The friend humors you. Here, your reputation for always having been a little cuckoo helps out. She merely thinks as she does up the package, that this is fresh proof of it.

It is curious, too, how one's shopping undergoes a metamorphosis. You don't go to the smart stores, for you no longer buy by the pound. You do not go to the chain stores either; they are too impersonal. You patronize, with your precious nickels and dimes, the little fellows; and soon you learn, if you have not done so before, to go to the Jews. I do not know whether it is because they are having this trouble in Germany, or whether they have always been so, but the Jewish storekeepers do not look coldly at you when you ask for a nickel's worth of butter. They are more likely to meet your eyes levelly, and put in an extra bit. It was the man at the bakery who told me after I had been in twice for a single roll, that I could buy two stale rolls for a penny. They are yesterday's rolls, he explains, but they are just as good, if you don't mind their being a little hard. He knew I would not mind. You can get a nickel's worth of cheese, too, and there is one place where they sell single cigarettes for a penny. The bakery man, who is my favorite storekeeper, told me about it the day when he offered me a cigarette, and I explained as I was smoking it, that I was rolling my own these days. There is a butcher, too, who gives me a nickel's worth of bones "for my dog," when I don't own a dog, and I am pretty certain he knows it. Otherwise, how would a stray bit of meat find its way regularly into the package of fresh soup bones—the kind I used to pay for at the rate of fifteen or twenty cents a pound?

There is a fraternity among the poor that my friends can know nothing about. It is true that their salaries and incomes have been slashed. They have had to curtail their luxuries, and cut out many, perhaps all, extras. They know, of course, that I am broke; but they cannot realize that actually, after this week, there will be nothing in the cupboard, and no more nickels and dimes to buy anything more to put into it. Just as I cannot consider it in the nature of a major tragedy that the M—'s have to do without a car this year and that Junior had to be taken out of the most expensive private school in the country and sent to a public school. When one comes to the end, one's idea of fundamentals changes considerably.

The things which are hardest are not at all what you would expect. The other evening I went to a free meeting, and went by the collection box placed near the door without putting anything into it. I was stopped and asked if I would not "please contribute." Goodness knows they have a right to demand support; they deserve it. Where I got the courage to refuse and then walk on calmly into the hall, I do not know. As I passed through the door, I heard one of the persons at the table say: "The nerve of her! I bet she's got plenty, too." "Yes," another replied, "it's that kind who always shirk."

Nor shall I forget in a hurry the look in the eyes of my favorite niece when I had to refuse her something which seemed to her vital. I had always been her last resort, and a never failing one. To one accustomed to dispense gifts with profligate liberality, the Christmas season was pretty difficult to live through. In the past, I have been Santa Claus and Lady Bountiful rolled into one for the benefit of my young nieces and nephews. Last Christmas there was nothing in their stockings from me and their parents are still trying to puzzle out the reason.

But I do have to keep myself from becoming morbid. I find myself reading over and over the recipes printed in the newspapers, the menus pasted on restaurant windows. When I begin to feel very sorry for myself, I go for a walk on the Common. There I see people as if I had never before used my eyes (as, indeed, I had not). No one has to point out to me those who come to feed the squirrels and the ones who come to enjoy the late autumn sunshine. A sixth sense picks out the derelicts. And they pick you out, too, those who have known hunger, and see beyond your good clothes. You go home feeling better, for you have looked upon people worse off than you are. To be comforted by the sight of a more wretched human being! That is one of several unattractive qualities in human nature which, in my loneliness, I have discovered in myself.

Next week, when this thing which is staring me full in the face today will be touching my cheek, I shall not even know which way to turn. If charity is the next step, where does one ask for it? I do not even know how to go about it. Next week I'll have to learn.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Homes for a New Deal

III: *The Shortage of Dwellings and Direction*

THE PRESENT situation in housing can be reduced to a few simple elements.

The first of these is that beneath the vacancies and the apparent surplus of urban dwellings there is a huge shortage—probably greater already than that which followed the War.

While housing statistics are wretchedly incomplete—although the Census concerns itself with the number of radio sets used—the Department of Labor publishes statistics for 257 representative cities which give a fair indication of the general drift. Between 1921 and 1929 the average number of new dwelling-units built was 388,000 per year. This was preceded by a low of about 100,000 in 1920 and again went down to 125,000 in 1930; 98,000 in 1931 and 27,000 in 1932. Since the average rate of 388,000 probably represents something near the need for new dwellings and replacements with the present birth rate and the present rate of obsolescence, we are now *914,000 dwellings in arrears merely in the 257 cities represented.* In addition, the sag in domestic building operations began in spots in 1926, three years before the depression was registered in Wall Street, and it was marked in every domain (except apartment building in New York City) after 1928. The arrears for the country as a whole are obviously much greater, although they are outside the possibility of even the roughest sort of statistical presentation.

When I refer to a shortage, I mean a physical shortage on the basis of the actual population and the actual accommodation necessary to house them in health and decency. I do not mean a market shortage; for as long as the depression holds there will probably be a surplus of dwellings on the market, as the result of the drastic contraction of space per family. The *physical* shortage was occasioned by the recent lack of building for every class, and by the *chronic* lack of decent building for the lower income groups.

The second point is that housing has a central place in any continuous public-works program that seeks to build up a steady basis for employment. Economists of the most diverse schools agree upon housing as a measure, even if they have only the faintest glimmerings of the principles necessary to carry it out. Every technician knows that housing makes heavier demands for labor than the more rationalized industries, even though the final product incorporates a large amount of machine-made goods. About 40 percent of the total costs go to labor on the job; and another 20 or so go to materials in which labor has already played a part. As the land costs and the financial costs of private building are diminished in a non-profit, government-aided project, the amount that goes to labor increases. This gives housing a unique place as a salvage measure. So far the government's move to employ housing in this fashion has been merely a slight gesture. It has not prepared for a long-term housing program. And because it has not instituted such a program, even its short-term program, with Robert D. Kohn, probably the ablest man in the country, to direct it, has been burked. The fault for this does not lie with the Housing Division but with the government's inadequate conception of the place of housing in a program of reconstruction.

Housing, then, has a first claim on our attention. It is the chief means available for establishing a permanent pool of employment, which may be expanded far beyond our past building schedules under private initiative; and it is the chief basis for redeeming our bankrupt cities with their equally bankrupt and destitute forms of urban environment, in which the factor of increasing leisure has been entirely ignored. The wiping out of the slums must be a part of a much larger program: it will succeed or fail as the larger program succeeds or fails. As Mr. Albert Mayer and Mr. Henry Wright have shown, slum clearance alone cannot possibly take the lead or set the pattern for new low-cost housing. Indeed, without a vastly augmented building program it will only create grislier and greater slums.

Unfortunately, the present state of housing is one of dangerous inertia. In the belief that the federal government has actually been putting through a large public-works program for slum clearance and low-cost housing, the public has failed to recognize the fact that the necessary steps toward such a program have not been taken; *indeed, the program itself has not been formulated.* Unless drastic steps are taken immediately, the opportunity to advance good and economical community housing—which is also the opportunity to redeem our wasted and misplanned and disoriented cities—may pass, and the policy of government aid for the sake of ensuring high standards and a wise expenditure of capital may be brought to an end. For if any business revival takes place, under the drastic shortage which will be evident as soon as families that have halved or quartered their dwelling space spread out again, there will be a hungry clamor for immediate private building. This will take place without community plans, without standards, without intelligent technical direction, and in the same rental range as was served by private building before the depression—namely,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one that continues to be out of the reach of well over half our population.

So far, the plans of the federal government have awakened false hopes that it has not redeemed; it has made pledges to realty interests—to build no more houses than are destroyed—that have stultified the intelligent housing program originally formulated by Mr. Kohn, and it has failed to show the short-sighted realty interests what really is best for them, if they are not to be carried away completely in the general debacle their ignorant methods have apparently produced. Finally, the government has even fallen short of the absurdly modest goal of putting its allotted $150 million immediately into the field of building operations in housing. While I have no desire to go behind the scenes in Washington, where in housing, as in everything else, opposing forces have canceled each other out under the guise of unremitting activity, it is necessary to say a word or two about what has happened in front of the curtain.

As part of a comprehensive policy of creating public works of permanent value, a Housing Division was set up under the Emergency Administration presided over by Mr. Ickes. In Circular Number One, issued at the end of July, the broad outlines were admirable. They wisely differentiated between low-cost housing and slum clearance, which "need not necessarily involve the construction of low-cost housing." To ensure low cost, only municipal housing or limited-dividend projects were sought, and a low interest rate (compared with any previous commercial market for even limited-dividend housing), 4 percent, was promised. A low rate of land costs compared with labor and material costs was favored; and except for the establishment of a thirty-year amortization—as compared with the fifty or sixty-year term found necessary and advisable in Europe—the policy was a sound and intelligent one.

There were, however, three weak spots in it, not the fault of the federal government. First and foremost was the universal ignorance of modern housing methods throughout America, and the almost universal lack of appreciation of the need for these methods. American housing, ever since the period of industrialization, has never reached the lower half of the existing income groups except in the form of low-grade inferior dwellings, badly planned and badly built, slums in conception as well as in final result. Sometimes these dwellings were foisted on the people who lived in them by methods of sale which kept the owners in the economic position of renters who held only a tithe of the dwelling in equity but who carried the whole risk, and who, upon losing their jobs, often lost their entire savings. These methods of building created blighted urban areas; but banks and realty interests and builders, for lack of better example, knew no other methods; and the whole process of making the poorly paid workers assume the unbearable burden of holding and redeeming these bad investments was even officially fostered by the government under the pious title of the Own Your Own Home Movement.

Neither American city planning, as practised in the past, nor American housing as undertaken by speculative builders and developers, was concerned to produce integrated housing communities, by means of unified plans and large-scale operations and coördinated administration. An inferior and costly technique of individual housing was encouraged for the sake of maintaining extravagant and essentially usurious means of finance. The results were (1) a low standard of housing, (2) a high risk, (3) blighted neighborhoods from which people tried to escape, (4) eventual private and municipal bankruptcy.

The next weak spot lay in the financial provisions of this housing policy. Although the government demanded only a small equity from the corporations and municipalities that submitted housing projects to Washington, it was trying, in effect, to tap water from a stone, since many of these municipalities were bankrupt and in some cases lacked even ordinary banking facilities. This weakness and the urgent need for action led the government to attempt in the fall to substitute a housing corporation of its own for those that were being offered, even in cities like Cleveland, which had heroically mapped out a large program and gone a long way through with the stages of preparation and reëducation and planning. There was plenty of justification for this policy; but it was based upon an altogether too sanguine belief in the government's capacity to make short cuts where local authorities and local technicians were stalled: after some months spent preparing the government's corporation, its very existence was challenged by the Controller General.

Meanwhile, there was still a third cause of delay, which would have prevented action on a large scale, even had the government taken complete responsibility for finance and taken the initiative in placing new projects from the beginning. This weakness lay in the lack of technicians who had studied and had intelligently grasped the technical, social and economic basis of modern community housing. Both housing and community building are new subjects in the architect's curriculum; and previous experience in laying out abstract street systems or building solitary buildings, even if they were skyscrapers, was absolutely no qualification for the new task. Had the government envisaged the task of housing on a broad enough scale, its record in aiding new construction during the first year might have been no better than it now is: but it would have allocated sufficient funds for the necessary technical staff, the necessary research, the necessary schooling of technicians, and the necessary educational program in the communities to be rehoused. Instead of doing this, the government put an impossible burden upon the shoulders of Mr. Robert Kohn and his handful of assistants. In inaugurating a housing program,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the inertia that prevented the spending of $150 million quickly and effectively during the first year was just as huge as it would have been if the government had purposed to spend ten times that amount; and the energies of the Housing Division, being strained to overcome this inertia, were not able to put into action speedily enough the money that had been allotted. Had the government utilized the housing projects which had already been accepted by the R.F.C., and had work on these projects been begun last March, the government would have given the Housing Division opportunity to concentrate on its own task while money for housing—some of it good, some of it bad—would have been put into circulation.

Apart from the difficulty of overcoming social inertia and technical lack of training in community housing, why have so few projects been approved to date? (Actually, twenty were approved up to January, 1934, with an allotment of around $50 million. On two of these, operations had begun by the middle of January. The remaining $100 million was ticketed for slum clearance under the so far abortive Federal Housing Corporation.) The reason so few projects have been approved has plainly been the result of the opposition of the realty interests. They have harried the government with continual criticism; they have got into position and obstructed an intelligent approach on many of the official housing boards; they have tried to divert attention and funds toward the individual house for individual ownership, so that they may unload what remains of their bad boom investments; they have caused the government to back water on the sound program that was originally laid down by Mr. Kohn; and by insisting upon slum clearance, they have managed to block effective action. The result is that the government has not given a consistent lead to the groups that were honestly attempting to get into action: on the contrary, by its marches and counter-marches it has pretty effectually discouraged them; while foot by foot it has whittled down a housing program, which was of value only as an entering wedge anyway, to such a thin sliver that it cannot serve even for this limited purpose. The pressure exerted by the realty interests has been relentless and unscrupulous; in defense of their will-to-profits they have given a perverse twist to the government's whole program.

That twist has been recorded in the P.W.A.'s statement of policy on December 10, 1933. "In the course of recovery," one reads there, "it may be assumed that the existing vacancies will disappear and that there will be demand for vacant sites and for urban and suburban houses. By confining the work of the Emergency Housing Corporation at the present time to the clearance of slums and the production of a like number of low-cost units, limited as to rentals and restricted as to occupancy to the low-income groups, the administration can stimulate one of the basic industries without encroaching upon its field of future opportunity."

With the adoption of that policy, the government has given the housing movement a serious setback: it has accepted as a desirable standard of achievement the scrambled, extravagant, disorderly and fundamentally anti-social methods in housing development that characterized the previous decade and led inevitably to municipal bankruptcy and into the untold hardships of the individuals who were caught with this bad housing and who lost even their poor share in it. As if this were not bad enough, the government, in the same announcement, added a further provision that effectually blocks an active housing program. For it has laid down that "municipal housing projects and those presented by Housing Authorities must show a rent level so far below any commercially produced as not only to put it outside of any possible competition with existing decent housing, but unquestionably meeting the needs of an income groups never before accommodated."

This means an end to slum clearance in the cities that have the worst slums; for in general these slums can be replaced only by housing planned for a higher income level. In addition, the government puts itself in the preposterous position of holding that higher standards can be instituted in housing at the same time that the prices achieved by the most inept and flimsy building and the lowest standards of health and amenity and recreation are not merely met, but *undercut*. There is a simpler way of putting this position: the government has temporarily given in completely to the demands of the financial and the realty interests and has no serious intention of lending money for any modern community housing whatever.

The circular I have quoted dates back to December; but it still holds. The inertia to which I have called attention dates back to last March; but it, too, still holds. The only things that do not hold are the original provisions with which the P.W.A. went to work to create emergency unemployment relief by large-scale housing construction. Unless the present policy is replaced and an adequate program laid down, we will soon be faced with a shortage in dwellings which will put the consumer at the mercy of the very interests whose dangerous short-sightedness and far-flung greed have done so much to bring on and maintain the present depression. Or, failing a revival in industry, to which large-scale housing itself would powerfully and steadily contribute, we shall relapse into even lower standards of housing than we had previously—in addition to the dilapidated buildings and the decayed neighborhoods, there will be room overcrowding and family congestion on a scale that only the most depressed classes have hitherto known. Neither of these conditions is tolerable; both of them must be remedied by a bold and intelligent housing policy which will cut the ground from under the interests that have strangled the present program. Housing, in fact, is now a critical challenge to social action and an ad-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

equate policy is the most pressing immediate problem and the one that promises as a long-term program to be a key to a number of far-reaching social results. LEWIS MUMFORD.

In the final article, Messrs. Mayer, Mumford and Wright, in collaboration, will lay down the outlines for a positive, social, long-range policy on housing.—THE EDITORS.

Washington Notes

Dictates of Rightward Policy—Faith, Hope and Financiers—Pawning the Last Jewel in Congress's Crown

WITH THE State Department rather on edge over the French-Austrian situations and their potentialities, and with the air-mail developments full of political dynamite, there has been in the past week more than enough to distract attention from the operations of the recovery program. One had to put aside the dramatics of the Roosevelt-Lindbergh incident and the menace of European conflict to realize that certain subtle changes are taking place. One of these shows up in the renewed confidence of the conservative element, within and without the administration, that the President is shifting toward its side. Personally, I do not believe that Roosevelt has made anything like a permanent shift. For one thing, I completely disbelieve in the permanence of any of his attitudes and so, too, I think, must anyone who has observed with more than superficial care the President's strategy during the past year. It has been made all too plain that his game is to keep the support of both liberals and conservatives, by first encouraging one and then comforting the other; in between them he stands as the Great Conciliator steering a smiling course as a reconciler of the two extremes. And in the present temper of the people, he is assured of a compelling public support for practically any compromise he works out or any proposition he advances.

At the moment, the leading liberals in this vicinity are somewhat disturbed by the report that Mr. Lewis W. Douglas, the Budget Director, has been restored as an intimate of the President—Mr. Douglas has pulled back on every feature of the New Deal from the start—but most particularly on the new financial policy. There is reason for believing that there is small foundation for this report of the renewal of the Roosevelt-Douglas intimacy. Mr. Douglas still continues to be a rather severe private critic of the Roosevelt program and his apprehensions about the future are by no means lessened.

It is true, however, that in recent days the President has seemed to see more of Secretary of Commerce Roper, of Governor Black and one or two others of the orthodox type, and has been less closely in touch with the social-reform group. What really disturbs the more progressive among his friends is what they regard as a disposition in the Treasury Department to conduct the new policy along lines acceptable to the Wall Street bankers, from whose tainted touch there is so much public shrinking upon the part of officials. Chief evidence of this disposition is said to be the frequent visits to the Treasury, for purposes of consultation, of Mr. Earle Bailie—the same Mr. Bailie who, under fire from Senator Couzens and other progressives, resigned from his Treasury post as Special Adviser.

To get back to this alleged conservative shift of the President—all it amounts to in reality is that the big task immediately ahead is the selling of a vast quantity of government bonds, both to provide money for the new expenditures planned and to refinance the short-term Treasury obligations that are falling due. To achieve this successfully, the President and the Treasury must have pretty wholehearted coöperation from the big banks. There are various ways of getting this. For example, it is possible for the government to put on enough pressure to compel coöperation. The President is averse to this. He would rather conciliate than coerce, and has had both personal and telephone communication with a number of New York financiers on the general subject of fiscal operations.

It is also true that there exists at the moment an earnest wish to encourage private industry in every way possible, to convince industrialists that the administration will be able to avoid paper inflation and that the N.R.A. codes are not going to be made over in such a fashion as to take away from industry the benefits it has obtained out of freedom from the anti-trust laws. It is not going to be easy to do this and still keep Senators Borah, Nye and a few others from making an effective, or at least a loud, protest, but such is the administration's hope. Back of all this is the feeling that private business must recover its initiative and enterprise before May. The President's hope is that by then industry will be able to absorb the bulk of those now on the civil-works pay roll. To promote this end, the intention is to remove the fears of private industry as completely as possible, stimulate it to throw aside its inertia and stand on its feet instead of leaning on the government.

Various means to this end have been suggested and some will be acted upon. It is this part more than anything else that causes uneasiness among the liberals. They know, for instance, of the President's willingness to approve some modification of both the Securities Act and the deposit-guarantee feature of the Glass-Steagall bank law. Hope has been held out to the bankers that the $2,500 limit will be retained but the full insurance program not pushed. They know, too, that real tax reform will be put off until next year, and that none of the proposals advocated by Professor Groves will be taken up for serious consideration. The tax bill will be passed in essentially the shape it came from the Treasury Department and with only the amendments of the Senate and House committees, which will not be of a radical nature.

Further, it is authoritatively said that the President intends to stand firm both on veterans' compensation and the civil-works appropriations. If he can do this—and there seems every reason to believe he can—it is argued that confidence among the business interests will be strengthened. They will have faith in his ability to stop the flow of federal funds for emergency expenditures, and genuinely balance the budget for 1936. That, it can be safely said, is Roosevelt's present idea, and in pursuance of it he naturally inclines to listen to his more conserva-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tive friends and to console the still paralyzed industries which are afraid to branch out before the adjournment of Congress.

Before the session ends it is Mr. Roosevelt's intention to ask of Congress the power to adjust tariff rates and make trade agreements with foreign nations. In brief he wants the tariff-making authority turned over to him. He has been urged that unless this is done there can be no permanent basis for either agricultural or industrial prosperity. He has been told that it is not possible to cut acreage enough or increase consumer demand sufficiently to balance the supply and demand of the large crops in this country. A substantial part of these crops must be sold abroad if American agriculture is to prosper; and unless agriculture prospers there can be no permanent industrial recovery. Convinced of the truth of these fundamental arguments, Mr. Roosevelt feels that the next great need of the recovery program is tariff adjustment. Congress, of course, cannot be depended upon for any adjustment that would be economically sound or beneficial. Last session, when Mr. Roosevelt thought of asking for this power, he was strongly advised against it, on the ground that he had already taken practically everything else away from Congress and it would certainly balk at this. If Congress now balks at this or any other White House request, it will surprise practically everybody, including itself.

T. R. B.

Washington.

Other People's Money

Easy Lessons in Strangulation—"The Times" Finds a Formula—For the Brothers Loved Their Town

THE NEW Stock Exchange Act proposes to put the stock exchanges under the control of the Federal Trade Commission. That is probably the best place to put them. But there will have to be an enlargement of the Commission if it is to fulfill all the functions that have been added to it: managing the stock and commodity exchanges, policing the N.R.A. and supervising the issuance of securities. Already the New York Stock Exchange is proposing that there shall be added two new commissioners who, with one existing commissioner, will constitute the Commission's arm for dealing with the exchanges and enforcing the Securities Act. Also, it is suggested that "two experienced stock-exchange men" be added. This, of course, would make a beautiful agency for regulating the Exchange. However, the suggestion puts the country on notice that appointments to the Commission should be watched with the greatest care.

We have seen what happened to the regulation of utilities under commissions appointed by "friendly" parties. In fact, we have seen the Federal Trade Commission, like the Tariff Commission and others, packed with men who became the best of friends with the very people they were appointed to regulate. How easy it is for the nation to slide into that same bottomless pit may be seen from the kind of men who are now being named, while the New Deal is still white-hot with holy religion.

Out in Cleveland they are making a fight on a utility commissioner, Mr. E. J. Hopple, whose record is said to show singular sympathy for the utilities he is now supposed to control. In the legislature, Mr. Hopple showed his attachment for the traction and coal interests by voting constantly against the interests of labor. He voted against giving municipalities the opportunity to issue bonds to acquire their own power plants, he voted to increase the salaries of utility commissioners, to enlarge the right of eminent domain for railway companies. Yet this gentleman is named by a Democratic Governor as utility commissioner, and Democratic politicians, who cry aloud for the New Deal, are defending the appointment.

The N.R.A. is naming Code Authorities and we are seeing a repetition of this same type of appointment right in the so-called heart of the New Deal. Here are some of the administrators to preside over the framing of codes: auto code—K. J. Ammerman, former sales manager of Packard; rubber code—A. L. Kress, formerly with U. S. Rubber Company. Add to this that in charge of the retail textile trade and banking codes are a group of men including the president of Dun and Bradstreet, an official of the Retail Drygoods Association and an assistant manager of a large New York department store. It would be possible to lengthen this list. But this will be enough to give us an idea of what can happen under the New Deal and hence what might be the result when the New Deal gets to be the Old Deal.

The New York Times has gone into action against the Stock Exchange bill. Of course it does not oppose regulation. That is looked upon even by the Exchange as inevitable, though its hope is to make the regulation as ineffective as possible. And this also is clearly the wish of those newspapers that look at the problem from the same side of the street as the Exchange. One thing that fills The Times with apprehension is the "mischievous" extent of the great powers granted the Federal Trade Commission, which is authorized to regulate margin requirements, to make rules in regard to short selling, to approve or disapprove transactions, to stabilize the market and so on. If it be true that these actually are "great" powers, it ought to be understood what their real character is. Margin requirements, stabilizing transactions, short selling, business conduct and such activities on the Exchange are all operations that vitally affect three general groups: first, the members of the Exchange; second, the people who deal with them; and third, the vast non-trading public whose economic life is profoundly affected by the Stock Exchange.

Now there doesn't seem to be any question that these things ought to be regulated. As a matter of fact, they are already regulated. The real question is not whether to regulate but where to lodge these great powers over functions in which the whole nation and the millions of investors are concerned. At present they are lodged in the Exchange. And to anyone who knows anything about the Exchange, that means in the small group of men who rule the Exchange, which in turn means the floor traders, who constitute the minority of the membership but who, by a device in the constitution of the Exchange, are enabled to perpetuate their control over it. These floor traders are, for the most part, just glorified gamblers, and not so glorified at that.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Is there any reason why the man who is willing to leave the regulation of these important factors affecting millions of investors and more millions of people to this small group of thoroughly irresponsible persons, should be horrified at leaving them to the Federal Trade Commission, which at least will have a disinterested point of view and a sense of public responsibility.

A more powerful argument for the bill could not possibly be made than The Times' assertion that manipulative purchases and sales, matched orders, the dissemination of false information and so on have already been prohibited by the Exchange. What could afford a clearer exhibition of the futility of the Exchange's own regulation than the persistence of these "prohibited" practices?

Mr. William Feather, the philosopher of business who is also a Clevelander, has found an excellent defense for his fellow townsmen, the Van Sweringens: the profits of the Van Sweringens outside of Cleveland ran into the millions and these were brought to Cleveland and spent there! It might also be said that Mr. Insull's profits outside Chicago were brought into that city and spent there. And Mr. Kreuger brought into Sweden millions which he got outside and spent in his native land. It is probably true that the Van Sweringens brought money into Cleveland. But the very law and the system that made the Van Sweringens possible also made possible scores, indeed hundreds, of others like them who did not work in Cleveland and who, doubtless, in the aggregate took as much money out of Cleveland into their various and respective native heaths as the Van Sweringens brought in. Mr. Feather adds that Cleveland does not fear men of the character of the Van Sweringens. That is too bad if it is true. It is pretty nearly time Cleveland and the rest of the country began to fear such men.

JOHN T. FLYNN.

Labor and the N. R. A.

Three Strikes Get Only to First Base—Please Check Your Union at the Door—The Water Cure for Laundries

DURING the past few weeks New York City has been the scene of three bitterly contested strikes on the part of workers who belong to the most underpaid and overworked groups in industry: laundry workers, taxi drivers and hotel employees. Twelve-hour days with pay as low as $5 a week are not uncommon in these industries where, even under the N.R.A., employers have been able to dictate the most oppressive terms. They have been able to do this chiefly because of the great surplus of labor among the unemployed, desperately willing to work under almost any conditions. Against such exploitation, the N.R.A. has thus far afforded little protection.

No codes have as yet been approved for the taxi industry, while the code for hotels and laundries are among the sorriest examples of the New Deal. The hotel code provides for a fifty-four-hour week, but perpetuates the highly objectionable "split shift," whereby employees are worked during the busy periods of the day and laid off during the slack hours. Thus, while a waiter or cook may work only eight or nine hours daily, his actual period of service may be spread over twelve hours. This makes a week of seventy-two hours, not fifty-four. In addition, the minimum-wage rate set in the code is, according to the hotel workers, made meaningless by two other provisions. One of these forces the workers to rely on tips for part of their compensation, and the other permits employers to charge for meals. The latter practice was virtually unknown before the N.R.A. and is, in effect, nothing but a device to counter wage increases. In a very real sense, accordingly, these three strikes can be regarded as spontaneous protests against both intolerable working conditions and the failure of the N.R.A. to correct them.

In point of completeness, the taxi strike, involving 30,000 drivers, was the most effective. At its peak, hardly a cab dared venture forth; for the drivers, though organized only in the most elementary way and divided among several contending unions, were at least united in their determination to make the strike unanimous. In the settlement, arrived at through the intervention of Mayor LaGuardia, the strikers gained one point. They were promised 50 percent of a special five-cent tax per ride, which the taxi companies have been collecting since October. This tax, originally levied to bolster the city's dwindling income, has been declared illegal, but the companies have continued to collect it. From it they now have some $2 million to be divided with the drivers. As to the other demands—union recognition, minimum wages, maximum hours—the strikers came off empty-handed. These points were left for subsequent arbitration and for the N.R.A. code discussions.

The hotel strike was only partially effective. Following the walk-out of the kitchen staff of the Waldorf-Astoria, the Amalgamated Hotel and Restaurant Workers' Union endeavored to make the strike general throughout the city. At no time, however, were more than 3,000 of an estimated 30,000 workers involved. But what the strike lacked in numbers it more than made up in mass demonstrations and picketing. These placed the hotels in an unfavorable light and caused numerous public functions to be transferred to hotels where the workers were not on strike. In addition, the publicity forced the hotel owners, who had announced early in the strike that they would not take back the strikers to retreat from this position. Last week the New York Regional Labor Board announced that the Hotel Men's Association had agreed that, if the strike were ended, they would discharge strikebreakers and reëmploy the former workers "so far as conditions will permit." The Amalgamated, faced by the opposition not only of the hotel owners but also of the A.F. of L. union, decided to accept this settlement, though it represents no gain whatever for the hotel employees, and leaves the union without recognition. After the settlement was announced, however, the hotels refused to take back many of the strikers, and so the picketing has continued.

The laundry strike, affecting approximately 3,000, is of special interest because of the engaging and, as far as we are aware, unique manner in which Mayor LaGuardia forced collective bargaining upon the laundry owners. He shut off their water supply. The laundries, it appears, owed the city considerable amounts in unpaid water bills. With

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their water turned off, the laundries capitulated over night, though they had defied the mediation efforts of the New York Regional Labor Board for more than a month. The strikers demanded payment of the state minimum wage of thirty-one cents an hour and recognition of the union. The laundry owners agreed to both of these conditions and also promised that all strikers would be rehired and the strike-breakers discharged. Payment of the minimum state wage, it is estimated, will approximately double the existing rate of pay in the laundry industry.

A few weeks ago we reported the appearance before the National Labor Board of representatives of the management and of the workers in the Harriman Hoisery Mill, Harriman, Tennessee. The officials of the company told the Board that they would not recognize an independent union under any conditions. They were willing to "bargain collectively, but not reach an agreement." It now develops that when the representatives of the workers returned to Harriman they were arrested for violating an injunction against union activities. In all, the company has now had some seventy-five workers placed in jail for picketing. Hearing of these oppressive tactics, the National Labor Board has adopted a resolution condemning the company for its apparent desire "to perpetuate discord, foster industrial unrest and obstruct the forces of recovery."

Preachment against Puritans

WE HAVE Lawrence Gilman's word for it that Richard L. Stokes and Howard Hanson, respectively the librettist and the composer of "Merry Mount," the American opera which had its première at the Metropolitan in New York City on February 10, are "enlightened citizens of a land which has awakened to the spiritual despotism of its past," and that they "conceived their operatic fable as a scarifying tract directed against the mental and spiritual savageries of our early colonial history." There is no cause to doubt Mr. Gilman's information. All that remains for us is sincerely to regret that the composer's enlightenment, in any case, was insufficiently bright and artistic to permit the opera to deal the enemy the blow so bravely conceived by him and his collaborator.

Puritanism, the foe, is ever with us; even if its aspect is not always so honest as the one it wore in seventeenth-century Massachusetts. Every fanatical perfectionist is a Puritan, forcibly striving to make human nature conform to some idea and ideal of purity, selflessness, austerity and efficiency, and usually, like the old New Englanders, provoking it to turn upon its tormentor in the form of hysteria, perversion and insanity. And not only the States, but the whole poor world from Moscow to Tokio, and Berlin to the Viminal, is racked today by innumerable theoretical little Cotton Mathers attempting to impose ideal states of unity upon mankind, drilling it into economic, social, intellectual purposiveness, and trying to make it renounce playful activities which, like pure art and other baking of cakes and brewing of ales, apparently serve no practical purposes and contain their own ends.

Your true Cavalier, of course, is one who does something, no matter what, that frees and refreshes the entire man, emotional and intellectual. But even an effective "preachment against Puritans" in the form of grand opera might conceivably provide a relish; and one's irritation with "Merry Mount" flows from the circumstance of the lyric tragedy's being nothing at all, effectively. This inferiority is due less to the libretto than to the score. Certainly, the idea is not very clear in Mr. Stokes's piece. His New Englanders are nothing positively, seemingly mere professional spoil-sports. And he is no poet and frequently a most naïve dramatist, and his last act is emotionally inconclusive. Yet he has drawn imaginatively upon Cotton Mather's "Wonders of the Invisible World." The license, again, with which he has made the actually sordid business at Merry Mount provide an ideal contrast with Puritanism, is legitimate. He has also presented his composer with plentiful opportunities for choral, dance and processional music. And the scene of the "hellish rendezvous" is grand theatre, especially where the hallucinated minister ecstatically signs the devil's book and curses New England as the price of the Astarte with the lineaments of the great lady who has rejected him.

Unfortunately, this libretto has been coupled by Mr. Hanson with a score which, except in certain choral passages, is insignificant. It has wisely been kept in large blocks, but it almost uniformly lacks finesse. The music expressing the minister's distraction is too soft. The Maypole music has been flatly modeled on English folk-dances. The intermezzo before the "hellish rendezvous" begins interestingly, for all its redolence of Debussy's "Sirènes"; but then Mr. Hanson does what he did in his "Romantic Symphony": he repeats his ideas over and over as though he were unable to move from the spot. If "Merry Mount" indicates anything, it is that his medium remains the chorus.

PAUL ROSENFELD.

Sagebrush

Gray,
Patient and humble, spotting the desert today;
Where the ash-yellow ridges look out to the south-facing
mesa wall,
Sandstone cliffs spotting the desert like roses: in pyramids
they fall.

Gray,
With the strident and pungent smell if you crush it in
your hand:
Bitter leaf, bitter root, sprung from the sun-blackened rock,
The brown crumbling sand.

Gray,
Over the slopes that stretch to the west away;
Past the dark green twisted bulk of the piñon going—
The thin juniper flames, the naked arroyos flowing.

A thousand miles you may ride on, you will find it, gray,
Still marking your way—
Softening the desert road, cooling with ash the flaming
sandstone walls,
Poised where the yellow dust settles, the blue thundercloud
crackles, the black-ribbed canyon falls.

JOHN GOULD FLETCHER.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A COMMUNICATION

General Johnson Defends the N.R.A.

SIR: May I take issue with "What Has Happened to Wages" [The New Republic, February 14]?

It says, among other things, "The President's Reëmployment Agreement (the Blue Eagle campaign) became effective about August 1. It is therefore fair to begin our measurement with the June figures. Now, may I quote from the President's Reëmployment Agreement, authorized July 27. "After August 31, 1933, not to employ, etc. . . . Not to work, etc. . . . Not to pay . . . less than, etc." It did not go into effect until well along in September. Only a few codes were in effect before September.

Since the assumption of August 1 was clearly erroneous, it is *not* (as you say) "fair to take the June figures" in measuring the effect of N.R.A. in cost of living. It is fair to take September. Taking September in any of the various indexes of the cost of living (except perhaps that of the Department of Agriculture where the variation is slight), you will find that between then and the end of the year *there was no increase in the cost of living. On the contrary, there was a slight decline.*

Now, as to employment under N.R.A. The figures on total pay rolls and factory employment in the United States are no criterion whatever of the effect of N.R.A. on pay rolls or employment any more than the *resultant* of several combining plus and minus forces is a criterion of one particular force. If four streams pour water into a reservoir and four take water out, you cannot measure the effect of one inpouring stream by gauging the depth of water in that reservoir. The prism resulting from that stream alone is net gain to the water supply regardless of outgo through other streams and must be computed separately. But that is exactly what your article *does not do.* What it *does* do is as misleading as possible. The only way to gauge the effect of N.R.A. on employment and pay rolls is to take a census of N.R.A. enterprise. This we have done by questionnaires tabulated by the census. They show a reëmployment of between 2,750,000 and 3,000,000, and an increase in wages at an annual rate of about $3,000 million.

Putting both sides of the equation together, then, with no increase in cost of living, this vast reëmployment (which was very close to what I estimated when I took the job) and this $3,000 million of increased wages were all clear gain to workers and your statement, "The net result of N.R.A. has been to *decrease* the real earnings of the average worker even below the poverty limit of last June," is a terrible thing.

I use the word "terrible" because the sole strength of N.R.A. is the confidence and support of workers and the public. You cannot police a law like this with penal sanctions. By shaking confidence through misstatements such as you used, you are destroying the principal reliance of workers at this crisis.

I know you do not want to do that.

HUGH S. JOHNSON,
Administrator, National Recovery Administration.
Washington, D. C.

[We are willing to accept General Johnson's statement that the starting point for the figures in judging the effect of the N.R.A. should be September instead of June. What is the result? The index of factory employment fell from 76.6 in September to 71.0 in December; unemployment increased. Pay rolls declined from 57.6 to 53.1. (These are the official indices of the Bureau of Labor Statistics and the Federal Reserve Board.) The index of per-capita earnings derived from these figures shows a drop from 75.2 in September to 74.8 in December. General Johnson says there was a slight decline in the cost of living between these two dates. We don't know how he knows; the official index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics issues no figure for September. But we should be surprised indeed if there was a decline sufficient to increase the real earnings of the average worker. Certainly the N.R.A. cannot take credit for any drop in the cost of living, because its codes in most cases permitted price boosting.

In the latter part of his letter General Johnson quotes figures showing a large reëmployment and a big increase in pay rolls, which he attributes to N.R.A. Since these figures do not jibe with the official and trustworthy indices of what happened between September and December, we are forced to conclude either that they cover a different period or that they are grossly inaccurate. In addition to the blanket reëmployment agreement itself, which was supposed to cover almost every occupation in the country down to the crossroads grocery, there are now in effect some two hundred separate codes which include virtually all the manufacturing industries employing large numbers of people, such as textiles, clothing, automobiles, steel, etc. The figures for manufacturing generally would scarcely show a contrary tendency to figures covering those industries under N.R.A.

Of course numerous influences have contributed to the trend of economic affairs; the N.R.A., as General Johnson says, cannot solely be blamed or praised, as the case may be, for the net result. But our argument was that the workers could not forgo organized action on their own behalf on the basis of a belief that the N.R.A. was sufficiently protecting them. The figures show that it is not.

General Johnson says that the N.R.A. relies on public confidence rather than on penal sanction. Of course it does. But the test of how much confidence it deserves lies in the results. We are heartily in favor of the *announced* aims of reëmployment at shorter hours and higher purchasing power. Our quarrel with the management of the N.R.A. is that it is not in reality pursuing the policies necessary to achieve the aims. Calling attention to its failure will not destroy confidence in it half so much as the failure itself. Facts, not boloney, will tell the story. Our judgment is, and has been for months, that without well-nigh universal labor organization independent of employers, without full protection of the right to strike and bargain collectively, and without control of prices in the interest of consumers by genuine representatives of labor and consumers, it will neither succeed nor deserve success—THE EDITORS.]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

That Rivera Fresco

SIR: To one who is neither communist nor esthete, the destruction of the Rivera fresco to make room for "an information booth" is bewildering as well as shocking; but perhaps it is the intention of the Rockefeller Center officials to install in the booth someone who will explain why a portrait of Lenin is more objectionable than the spectacle of a calculated vandalism that is prompted by avarice and fear.

New York City. TERENCE HOLLIDAY.

A Room with a View

SIR: Of "Flush" [reviewed in The New Republic of January 24] two things should be said:

1. It is of the nature of a *jeu d'esprit.* Virginia Woolf has followed each of her two greatest books with a light-hearted one—"To the Lighthouse" with "Orlando," "The Waves" with "Flush." The critics who complain because it is short and light would complain because skis are long and narrow instead of rounding and webbed.

2. It has one crystal-clear theme. The life in Elizabeth Barrett's room in London was suffocatingly limited for a dog; for a woman of genius it was worse. The privation of air, liberty, sex and friendliness, distresses one on behalf merely of a spaniel. Vitally starved by like privations, a gifted human being attempted nevertheless to write.

"It seems to me indisputable," said Virginia Woolf, "that the conditions which make it possible for a Shakespeare to exist are that he shall have predecessors in his art, shall make one of a group where art is freely discussed and practised, and shall himself have the utmost freedom of action and experience. Perhaps in Lesbos, but never since, have these conditions been the lot of women."

Elizabeth Barrett had less "freedom of action and experience" than her dog. It is a theme that could hardly be handled without rankling and bitterness; Virginia Woolf handles it with wit and urbanity.

Resentful, irritated or baffled criticisms of "Flush" can excite only mirthful astonishment.

Seattle, Wash. LOIS E. BROWN.

Sound vs. Fury

SIR: Mr. Paul Rosenfeld's article, "The Assault on the Battery" [The New Republic, January 24], seems to have been released at too late a date. Fashions in music, alas, change as frequently as fashions in wearing apparel. Mr. Rosenfeld nothwithstanding, ultra-modern composers today are stressing the melodic, the simple and the singable, as witness: Werner Josten's "Concerto Sacro," Stravinsky's violin concerto, Ravel's "Bolero" and piano concerto, *et alia.*

"This sybaritic motive, this feeling," Mr. Rosenfeld says, "would appear to be in the first place a certain unlyrical disposition characteristic of our time and favorable to the exploitation of instruments far less humanly vibratory than strings or brass or woodwinds."

To rebut this, permit me to quote from my interview (The Philadelphia Record, January 28) with George Antheil, who, heaven knows, has been as daring as any anarch of music: " . . . I believe that the short, hectic, staccato music is a thing of the past, that a broader and more placid melodic line is much more modern than neurotic, hysterical rhythmic combinations that go under the name of contemporary music. . . . Certainly no one has toyed with more theories than I, but I have gotten around to the belief that writing real music is the most vital need today. The test of music is its singability, its appeal to the ear and its retentiveness. . . . And so today I am striving to write simply instead of heaping one stunning effect on the other."

Perhaps, in his groping for mystical motives, Mr. Rosenfeld overlooks the fact that the percussive tonal assaults were the final explosion of a decadent style, never so viable as ubiquitous, and more the tantara of a return to reposeful music than a permanent mode. . . .

SCHIMA KAUFMAN.

Philadelphia, Pa.

SIR: As I see it, a lot of musicians here and abroad are industriously warming over stale stuff with the plea that they are stressing "the melodic, the simple and the singable." But melodists are born, not made from repentant instrumentalists. Stravinsky's violin concerto is an inferior piece, considered as such even by his staunchest partisans; and Ravel's "Bolero" is an infernal bore, if ever there was one. No, I am afraid the "reposeful" music of some of Mr. Kaufman's friends does not demand our serious consideration. Sterility is older than the mountains.

By the way, Mr. Kaufman made me a present, an unwelcome one at that, of the word "sybaritic." My sentence began "This *subjective* motive, this feeling, etc.

New York City. P. R.

Writers, Too, Demand Relief

SIR: I write to point out the organization of the Unemployed Writers' Association of New York, now with 400 dues-paying members, around the platform of (1) Recognition of the profession of writing by the government, (2) Right to a secure existence as writers, (3) Wages or relief without discrimination, (4) Right to craft subdivision, (5) Right to complete literary freedom, (6) Support of unemployment insurance.

The project calls for a government-subsidized printing plant, a committee to judge writers upon which the Association will be represented, and various projects for various types of writers, including newspapermen, translators, encyclopedia writers, etc., as well as creative writers. We are asking that work be given to writers immediately, work that suits them, and that this should be paid for out of the $950 million which is just now in the hands of Harry L. Hopkins. Writers will be judged by the following standards (1) Published work, (2) Writing jobs held, (3) Manuscripts. We demand a minimum of $30 a week, as the artists are getting, but for *all* unemployed writers.

Signers to our petitions or sympathizers by telegram include: Theodore Dreiser, Sherwood Anderson, Michael Gold, F. P. Adams, Ellis Parker Butler, Granville Hicks, John Wexley, Scott Nearing, Maxwell Bodenheim, Malcolm Cowley, Jack Conroy, Edwin Seaver, J. C. Grey, Albert Boni, Josephine Herbst, Max Eastman, Virgil Geddes, Edward Dahlberg, etc. Clubs whose official or semi-official approval we have include: Authors' League, Writers' Guild, Poetry Society, John Reed Club, Newspaper Guild, Artists' and Writers' Dinner Club, National Writers.

A writers' mass meeting will be held at Greenwich House, 29 Barrow Street, New York City, at 8 P.M. on Saturday, March 3.

ROBERT WHITCOMB.

New York City.

Extracts from Letters

THE article "Sub-Marginal Farmer's Wife" in our issue of February 7 brings the following comment from Mr. H. O. Barlow of Duluth, Minnesota: "The case of the farmer's wife who had so much trouble clothing her children: first she should have bought a sheep or two, then she would have had some wool to spin, then she could have taught her children to knit (I learned to knit when ten years old), eventually she could weave. I remember meeting Swedish people over fifty years ago who could take the wool off a sheep's back and make cloth out of it, and good cloth too, no rotten cotton which is fit only for Negroes and Protectionists."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Faith and Tosh

Broomsticks, Amen! by Arthur Greensfelder. Little Theatre, February 9, 1934.

The Shining Hour, by Keith Winter. Booth Theatre, February 13, 1934.

IN 1820 John George Hohman published his "Long Lost Friend," a book of mysterious and invaluable remedies for man as well as animals. Whosoever carried this book with him was safe from all his enemies, visible and invisible, nor could he die, drown or burn up without the holy corpse of Jesus Christ, nor could any unjust sentence be passed upon him. The book contains remedies for fevers, fits, attaching dogs to oneself, for the wild-fire, warts, bleedings, colics and so on, and securities against witches, thieves and other such afflictions of our life.

This practice of "power" and "pow-wows" was at its height when Hohman's book appeared, but its sales continue to this day. The scene of "Broomsticks, Amen!" is modern: the living-room of the Hofnagel's home in a Pennsylvania Dutch village; the emotional quality is German, and some of the family sense German. The "power" healing is practised by the father of this house, without pay, his great hope is God, his great hatred doctors. The daughter returns with the news that she is to be married, is going to have a baby, is engaged to a young man about to become a doctor. The child is born, is later on ill, the old father shoots the young husband to prevent his administering the serum; and applies his own methods. The child dies. The government is investigating the faith-doctors' abuses in the district. In the end the father will not allow the others to shield him, and is carried off by the county officer. There is, meanwhile, a blind son, whom the doctors have not helped, and who moves throughout the play, along with the daughter, as the doubting element secured only by affection to the father.

It is clear that this is rich material, a genuine section of America, a substance of faith and conflict, and a chance for word, speech and character rhythm. To this would be added the flavor of the local, and the glow of isolated feeling and crisis. The first trouble with the play, to confront Mr. Arthur Beckhard's directing of it, is that the dramatist has not decided on just what he means to do: it is now comedy, now oddity, now pathos, now tragedy, with juxtapositions that only a strong fluency of movement and mood could manage without breaks and drops in the stage effect. The trouble, also, in a yet more fundamental sense, lies in the lack of any basic idiom. There is no bath of speech within which the whole can float, no heard vibration that is continuous. In the ordinary Broadway journalism and in many of our serious-obvious plays this idiom is not even expected. But for "Broomsticks, Amen!" the place, the people and the theme of family affection, faith practice, modernity and governmental science demand this sustaining idiom. Without it, we see what happens: speeches are suddenly odd or laughable, almost punches and points, when they should appear within a complete whole that is all odd, all recognizably human, all of one organic texture. Speeding up the whole performance, for closer cues and readier attack would help this defect; but the play remains against the current of the director's skill, even so careful a director as Mr. Beckhard. On the whole it should, I think, be played as tragedy, in which if it is deep enough, the plentiful comedy will find a place easily. Nevertheless, "Broomsticks, Amen!" is worth seeing because of its material implied, because of elements created in the play and in the actors by the director, and because of some of the acting. Miss Jane Seymour is very good indeed as a believing neighbor. Mr. William Schoeller gives an excellent performance as the power healer; Miss Jane Adair, as the healer's wife, creates truly the bridge between faith and hard facts that love can afford us. Rarely on the stage, in fact, have I seen so convincing an effect of love and the family bond as these two actors and Mr. Byron McGrath, playing the blind son, create. Of the three performances Mr. McGrath's is the best; it holds back within itself the deep source of the emotion possible to the character, and does most to bind the story together through an unbroken, withheld but never stagy intensity. His moments in contact with the old father are fine acting.

The tragedy of "The Shining Hour" is, doubtless, a soft and agreeable evening. The chirpy intercourse among the characters themselves is often diverting, that much is certain. Henry Linden brings his beautiful wife of a year to stay in the country at his brother David's for the six months before his own house will be ready. Mariella, the wife, likes Henry but has married largely to be married; while David's wife, Judy, loving him so, has led him into thinking he wanted to marry her. The one and only pathos created in the play was this role, which the dramatist defines and which Miss Adrianne Allen played for its full and elusive values. Miss Gladys Cooper, on her American début, presents the beauty that seems the only thing about Mariella that is definite, and plays with taste and competence whatever seems to be on hand to do. Otherwise we learn that this beautiful newcomer in David's home is clear about herself or something like that; and so David and Mickey, the younger brother, fall in love with her, and Judy rushes into a burning barn in order that David and Mariella may have each other and Mariella not get less clear. Mr. Derek Williams' Mickey was good, and Miss Marjorie Fielding's Hannah, the tart old-maid sister, could not have been better.

Mr. Raymond Massey, as David going away with Miss Gladys Cooper, was even worse miscast than he was two seasons ago as Hamlet, where Shakespeare after all lent a hand. Mr. Massey as an actor has much at-homeness and a genuine stage sense for keeping things frittering around. With regard to acting, there seems to be in him some adolescent conception that any crumpling into easy disorder or unattractive abandonment of life's externals, or shall we say to life's externals, amounts to sincerity in art. I cannot see, to take another field—that a horse sitting in his stall with his legs crossed and biting his hoofs establishes anything more sincere than when, for example, his fleetness carries him across the pasture—but no matter. "The Shining Hour" is one of those plays that appear to move in a vacuum: there is a putter of changing clothes, tea, bickering details, witticisms, calamities and felicities of weather, fire or death; but there is nothing out of life that really cuts across the one line of uncreated, silly fiction.

STARK YOUNG.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS IN REVIEW

Santayana's Orthodoxy

IN THE first of these five essays,[1] Mr. Santayana remarks that although all philosophies are frail, since they are products of the "reactive, spontaneous and volatile" human mind, yet there are certain comparatively steady principles. "These principles form a sort of orthodox reason which may become the current grammar of mankind." The two great representatives of this orthodoxy are, in Mr. Santayana's mind, Aristotle and Spinoza; and one need not confine oneself to the present work to find evidence that he likes to think of himself as one of the relatively few among modern philosophers with the sanity and simple candor to adhere to orthodoxy. Nor need the fact that in his recent metaphysical excursions Mr. Santayana seems to have transferred his spiritual allegiance to Indian thought be seriously disturbing, since one aspect at least of the Greek view of the universe is congenial to an elevation of the supremely real beyond nature and hence beyond science as well as beyond experience.

Fortunately and unfortunately, Mr. Santayana's own orthodoxy is extremely heretical. Fortunately, because his departures confer upon him an originality lacking in the orthodox who are strict in their orthodoxy. Unfortunately, because—in spite of the charm and piquancy with which his deviations from the correct line are set forth—he often seems to take back in one paragraph what he has said in another, so that one is at times not quite certain how much of his genial irony may be directed at himself.

His first essay, from which I have already quoted, deals with "John Locke and the Frontiers of Common Sense." Here Locke is depicted as the embodiment of two opposing tendencies. On the one hand he represents the essential common-sense position: that, although our contact with reality is only through the medium of ideas (of whose nature we have an immediate intuition), yet the practical demands of our being, rooted in our animal and material nature, force upon us an unwavering faith in the existence of a substantial material world that is the ground of our own existence and the only object of knowledge (as distinct from the enjoyable immediate intuition of essences). Mr. Santayana's first objection to this side of Locke's philosophy is that he took scientific ideas a little too seriously, not seeing that such conceptions as space and atoms were themselves as human and graphic as our sensations of sound and color, and that they require, just as do the latter, animal faith for connection with existence. His other objection is that Locke did not take with sufficient seriousness the realm of intuitions—on their own account and in their own content—since his puritan predilections hindered his perception of their value as material for art, for fiction and music. "A good God," he murmurs, "would not have made us poets against our will."

But on the other side of Locke's philosophy, Mr. Santayana finds him to be the source of what he has elsewhere called "malicious psychology"—the resolution of ideas into states of consciousness, until states of mind form the whole of the known and knowable universe. As against this conception Mr. Santayana refers to a conception of his own, that neither of the two kinds of legitimate psychology, scientific and literary, is concerned with "disembodied mental states." Scientific psychology is biological, and falls within the province of physical science, while literary psychology is animated by interest in human nature —the interest which Santayana justly calls "moral"—and describes experience in terms that are imaginative, while always retaining the sense of the material world as the setting in which human experience—pleasures and pains, emotions and images—go on.

I have given an undue amount of space to what I hope may pass for a summary of the first essay. But I have done so because I think Mr. Santayana's treatment of Locke illustrates his heretical departure from the orthodoxy he admires. The dualism of mind and matter which he regards as Locke's essential record of common sense is as far from Aristotle as was Descartes himself—whether Spinoza can be forced into it or not. And this dualism runs through every essay in the volume. On the one hand, Mr. Santayana is a materialist *à l'outrance,* holding that matter is the only existence having causal efficacy, while he suspects that Democritus with his atoms and Newton with his absolute space and time are truer guides in this realm than contemporary physics with its relativity and quanta. On the other hand, he believes that there is nothing of value save the poetic and moral realm, the realm of ideas and feelings. Since it is the source of all value, the idealistic philosophy, which is scientifically false, has at least the merit of being an exploration of this realm, which the prosaic and scientific mind tends to neglect. Science, on the contrary, is but a symbolic rendering of a world unknown in itself, a transcript valuable because it is a necessity of our organic and practical nature. Few commentators seem to have grasped that Santayana's view of science justifies it only as a "pragmatic" escape from that enclosure within our own images and feelings which, on purely theoretical grounds, is completely justified. I cannot regard this rather thrilling mode of escape from thoroughgoing cognitive skepticism as other than an interesting and highly personal heresy. Santayana is even more Lockean than Locke.

The essay on "Revolutions in Science," the third in order, seems to indicate double-mindedness even more strikingly. On the one hand, he finds in the latest outgivings of science a virtual acknowledgment—even if one not as yet recognized by the leaders in the revolution of science—that science does not pretend that it is "laying bare the intrinsic nature of things." It yields "practical assurances couched in symbolic terms, but no ultimate insight." This achievement is a great gain, for it emancipates science so that it can deal with the territory in which it is most at home, the intuition of mathematical essences. For, as he says, "intelligence is never gayer, never surer, than when it is strictly formal." But afterwards he concludes that this revolution takes science farther away from experience and that it is allied to a faith in private perspectives which implies the substitution of intellectual anarchy for the good old faith of classical physics in substantial atoms and absolute space and time. If Mr. Santayana confined his doubts to those interpreters, like Eddington and Jeans, who are turning scientific findings into a mystical metaphysics, I could understand his doubts. But he seems to be turning his earlier blessing into a distrust, if not a cursing, of the tendencies of modern science itself.

[1] Some Turns of Thought in Modern Philosophy: Five Essays by George Santayana. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 121 pages. $1.75.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I cannot indicate how the other two essays, one on Freud's discovery of the principle of inertia, or habit, after his earlier exclusive celebrations of the principles of pleasure and pain, and the other on Benda's enthusiasm—in its literal sense—for the realm of infinite and nonexistent and undefined possibilities, bear upon Mr. Santayana's heretical version of the "orthodox" tradition. The first contains, however, such a charming statement of Mr. Santayana's personal position that I shall quote it in full:

> The ineptitude of our esthetic minds to unravel the nature of mechanism does not deprive these minds of their own clearness and euphony. Besides sounding their various musical notes, they have the cognitive function of indicating the hour and catching the echoes of distant events or of maturing inward dispositions.

Here in two sentences are his fundamental skepticism, his purely practical justification of knowledge, and his unfailing sense of the significance of the poetic and moral. Why should this deeply original personal vision be offered us as a contemporary restatement of Aristotle and Spinoza?

JOHN DEWEY.

Novels as News

The Postman Always Rings Twice, by James M. Cain. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. $2.

First Love and Last, by Howard Coxe. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. $2.

A Modern Tragedy, by Phyllis Bentley. New York: The Macmillan Company. $2.50.

Cloud Howe, by Lewis Grassic Gibbon. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company. $2.50.

The Unforgotten Prisoner, by R. C. Hutchinson. New York: Farrar and Rinehart. $2.75.

NOVELS tell the real news about human beings; they tell it more accurately and more understandably than any other means of communication yet invented. Whether or not this appears to be a cynical statement, I believe it is true. Fallible in themselves, as all personal communications are, novels often incur a further fallibility by trying to interpret what they can only report. Like more apparently impersonal bulletins, they mix a good deal of rumor, conjecture and outright invention in the news they give us; and reviewers, whose trade is to make confusion more confounded, proceed to hang on these convenient pegs any old hat they want to. The situation is perhaps no more desperate than usual, but the situation is bad. Some observers, with a decided cast in the left eye, will tell you that all really "important" novels are announcing the Gospel according to St. Marx; others, who squint to the right, think they see the Renaissance of Romance. The air is full of motes; no wonder everyone is slightly cock-eyed.

None of these five novels is "important," but they don't have to be. The news they tell is as authentic and as up-to-date as news ever is. It may be thought far-fetched or near-sighted to see in these five books, written from apparently different points of view and from both sides of the Atlantic, a common attitude; but it is possible. And that attitude is neither revolutionary nor romantic nor even optimistic, but tragic, resigned.

"The Postman Always Rings Twice" (the title must be surrealist, for it has nothing to do with the story) might seem an immediate exception, but only because its news is more than ordinarily diluted with invention—or sentimentality, if you prefer. It is a brutal story of adultery and murder whose appropriate setting is a wayside filling-station in California. Up to a certain point, it rings horribly true: the bungled attempt at murder, the unsuccessful crime, the maggots of mutual suspicion that begin to prey on the guilty partners. But then Mr. Cain begins to make things up. He has almost succeeded in showing two triumphantly evil people—the reader is uncomfortable but can't let the story drop—when his intention falters: he converts his two villains into another Paolo and Francesca and rings down the curtain on a Hollywood-tragic ending. "The Postman Always Rings Twice" is a short, meretricious but exciting book; it does not pretend to tell the whole story, but it does pretend to tell nothing but the truth.

Mr. Coxe's "First Love and Last" is a simple and ingenious experiment with time. Mr. Coxe does not treat his imponderable theme as a solid or as an inextricable dimension or as "the unique subjective"; he simply shows that it is humanly true to look at time backwards as well as forwards. The story "begins" in 1932, "ends" in 1894. For an old lady such as his heroine, who has just been informed by her doctor that she has not much longer to live, that is surely a very natural way to look at time. Mr. Coxe's tacit thesis—that the climax of such a life comes not at death, but in youth—is certainly arguable, but he has made out a good case for it. The technical difficulty in such a backward-looking narrative is continuity; the author has solved it, fairly successfully, by arbitrary omissions of several years at a time. A great advance over Mr. Coxe's first novel, "First Love and Last" is quietly and well written. And there is more than ingenuity in its method: this new way of telling old news will haunt the reader long after he has laid the story down.

Miss Bentley is a very settled kind of novelist. If you wanted to damn her books with faint praise you would call them "worthy." If you tried to do her justice, on the other hand, you would have to use some synonymous epithet. Even for people who have never seen the mill towns of Yorkshire, she has succeeded in summoning up the almost tangible scene of a decaying industrial community. With her characters she is not so successful; they are mere subsidiary puppets to the story she has to tell. "A Modern Tragedy" narrates the rise to affluence and decline to jail of an ambitious lad who let a more ambitious rascal use him as a cats'-paw. Miss Bentley tries to show that the tragedy of dishonorable failure is inherent in the characters of the two men; but, though she goes through all the correct psychological motions, we are not so much moved by their downfall as by their helplessness. She writes of types that are recognizably human, but her types are never individualized to the degree where we can share their being.

If you are the kind of reader whom much dialect makes mad, you may not penetrate very far into "Cloud Howe"; especially as Mr. Gibbon lays it on with what seems at first like an affected smirk. If you give up in disgust, however, you will be missing something. If you persevere, the dialect will soon sink to an unconsidered murmur, and if only for its anecdotes, "Cloud Howe" is worth the trouble of reading. Its story (the second of a series of three, but that makes no difference either) is the time-honored one of a fanatical young parson with his pagan wife settling in a hard-bitten Scottish village whose inhabitants are all curmudgeons, roysterers, misers or worse. The book reeks with sentimentality, but not the cozy Barrie sort; it has gusto, a rare quality these days, and a lusty sprinkling of salt Scots humor. It is a tragi-comedy, but a good book.

Mr. R. C. Hutchinson should not be confused with A. S. M. Hutchinson, the author of "If Winter Comes," but I

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fear he will be. This would be a pity, for "The Unforgotten Prisoner" gives us much straighter news than anything that has lately been issued by England's Priestleys and potentates. The story is improbable, but not too improbable to hold water. It turns on the gradually discovered relationship between a respectable Englishman and a German orphan, half-crazed by a childhood spent among the unchildish adventures of post-war anarchy. It is perhaps sufficiently high praise to say that the German scenes read as if they had been written by a German. Though the book is marred by that deep-seated, sly sentimentality of which only Englishmen are capable, and which takes the twin forms of introducing malapropos humor and cutting out all direct expressions of sentiment, its effect as a whole is noble. They are brave words that Mr. Hutchinson writes. That, too, is old news, but there has not been too much of it in recent years. T. S. MATTHEWS.

Helen Keller's Other Self

Anne Sullivan Macy: The Story Behind Helen Keller, by Nella Braddy. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company. 382 pages. $3.

THIS IS a story that needed to be told. With a part of it—the mature achievement of Anne Sullivan Macy in the education of Helen Keller—we were already familiar. It is one of the great heroic stories of contemporary life. But to understand just how extraordinary this achievement was, it is necessary to know also the story of Anne Sullivan's education. In the life of Helen Keller she appears—at the age of twenty-one—as a savior; a self-possessed, resolute, devoted and highly intelligent young woman whose background and preparation one could assume to be that of Boston, the Boston of the Perkins Institution and of Samuel Gridley Howe. Actually, Anne, or Annie Sullivan, as she was called, entered the Perkins Institution from the state poorhouse at Tewksbury at the age of fourteen, totally illiterate and almost totally blind.

She was the child of Irish famine refugees. When she was seven years old her mother died of consumption and shortly thereafter her father deserted his family. The remaining relatives shipped her and her little crippled brother Jimmie to the poorhouse, where for three years they were confined in the women's hospital ward. Then Jimmie died and Annie was wholly alone. The story of Tewksbury during those years is like a series of drawings by Hogarth. There were crowding, filth, neglect and disease; the insane, the tubercular, the epileptic and the degenerate were all herded together. Among them moved the brilliant, nearly blind child who had never had a day's schooling, frequently unhappy and rebellious, but always eager, curious and indomitable. Mrs. Braddy has told this part of the story superbly—simply and vividly as she got it from Mrs. Macy some fifty years later.

When, by an extraordinary combination of luck and sagacity, Annie Sullivan managed to get herself transferred to the chaste Protestant atmosphere of the Perkins Institution, she was at first far more bewildered and unhappy than she had been at Tewksbury. It was her first conscious experience of inferiority. She was fourteen and illiterate among children who had all had some education. She was Irish, Catholic, and came unkempt and shabby from an institution where she had been a public charge. The bitter precocious wisdom she had acquired there, the confused background of Irish and Catholic folklore, of underdog

WE KNOW *you'll like these books*

★ **THE STORY OF THE SFORZAS**
By L. COLLISON-MORLEY
Author of "The Story of the Borgias," etc.

The names of three famous families stand out in all accounts of the Italian Renaissance; the Medici who ruled Florence, the Borgias of Naples and the Sforzas who intermarried with the other two and who were Dukes of Milan.

Although there have been many books about the Medici and the Borgias, there is strangely enough no book now in print in the English Language about the Sforzas.

In this delightful book the author displays the dramatic lives of this great Italian family against the background of their times, and spares no effort to make them stand out as individuals with the many great men who were brought into their orbit. This is the story of strange passion, violent intrigue, and brilliance in art and warfare—running through one of the greatest epochs in human history.

The book is already receiving the plaudits of the English Press. The Times Literary Supplement points out, "the care and lucidity with which the author marshals his facts so as to give a clear background of history to these extraordinary and fascinating characters." $3.75

★ **FOOLS RUSH IN**
By ANNE GREEN

This popular author of romantic bestsellers, "The Selbys," etc., gives us another light-hearted picture of Miss America innocently abroad. Once again you will find her colorful, wayward prose, her French *elan,* her remarkable character drawing, and the sparkling humor that so delights her American readers. Eleanor Rockwell is Anne Green's new heroine—attractive, full of personality, and of Southern heritage. You will enjoy first meeting this charming girl in the city of Baltimore and later experiencing with her her romantic adventures in Paris. Best of all, you will thoroughly enjoy the final climax of surprise, which ends this story. $2.50

★ **THE LETTERS OF LORD BYRON**
GEORGE GORDON, 6th Lord Byron
Selected by R. G. Howarth, M. A.
with an introduction by Andre Maurois
illustrated in photogravure by 16 contemporary portraits.

Nearly three hundred letters, carefuly selected to illustrate every phase of the poet's life are given here—in the only satisfactory form short of the six-volume Prothero edition. A number of these letters are from copyright sources. It is only from Byron's letters, as M. Maurois says, "that we can imagine with any sort of probability the man who was, with Napoleon, one of the two most remarkable figures of the nineteenth century." $3.00

Take this coupon to your bookstore or order direct

E. P. DUTTON & CO., 300 Fourth Ave., N. Y. C.

Please send me the following books:

☐ The Story of the Sforzas $3.75
☐ Fools Rush In 2.50
☐ The Letters of Lord Byron 3.00
☐ Money enclosed ☐ Send C. O. D.

Name.....

Address.....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

DEBATE

COMMUNISM vs. FASCISM

Capitalism Is Dying! Will Communism supplant it or Fascism prop it up a while? Hear the

Stirring Debate

between

Clarence A. HATHAWAY
Editor, The Daily Worker

and

Lawrence DENNIS
Leader of Fascism in America.

Mecca Temple 130 W. 55 St. N. Y. C. March 4 8 P. M.

Tickets: $1.10; 83c; and 55c. On sale at New Masses, 31 E. 27th Street, (mail orders filled) Workers Bookshop 50 E. 13th Street, and other central points.

Auspices:
Press League and New Masses

THEATRES

THE THEATRE GUILD presents
EUGENE O'NEILL'S comedy
AH, WILDERNESS!
with GEORGE M. COHAN
GUILD THEA. Fifty-second Street West of Broadway Eves. 8:20—Mats. Thurs. & Sat. at 2:20

MAXWELL ANDERSON'S new play
MARY OF SCOTLAND
with
HELEN HAYES, PHILIP MERIVALE, HELEN MENKEN
ALVIN THEATRE, —52nd Street, West of Broadway— Eves. 8:20. Mats. Thurs. and Sat. 2:20.

EUGENE O'NEILL'S NEW PLAY
DAYS WITHOUT END
HENRY MILLER'S Th., 43d St., E. of Broadway—8:40 Matinees Thurs. and Sat.—2:40

THEATRE UNION'S STIRRING HIT!
PEACE ON EARTH
SIDNEY HOWARD says: "Real theatre, the like of which is not on Broadway."
CIVIC REPERTORY THEATRE, 14th St. & 6th Ave.
Lowest Priced HIT in New York 30c to $1.50 No Tax | Eves. 8:45. Mats. Wed & Sat. 2:45.

LECTURES

THE PEOPLE'S INSTITUTE
AT COOPER UNION
8th Street and Astor Place, at 8 o'clock
Admission Free

Friday, Feburary 23rd
NATHANIEL PEFFER
"The Twilight of Capitalism."

Sunday, February 25th
PROFESSOR HOUSTON PETERSON
"Ominous Symbols: The Psychology of a Plunger."

Tuesday, February 27th
PROFESSOR EDWARD KASNER
"Development of the Number Concept."

Friday, March 2
NATHANIEL PEFFER
"Nationalism and Capitalism: Survival or Decay?"

politics, the haphazard and grim assortment of facts and notions which was her mental baggage, were discounted or despised. Yet here too her intelligence and vitality enabled her to surmount the difficulties of the environment and her own handicaps. Here too she met in time with understanding kindness and friendship. An operation on her eyes, some time after she entered the institution, partially restored her sight. She could read, not in Braille or from metal type as the blind must, but like a normal person, and she could read what she chose. In 1886, six years after entering the institution, she was graduated as valedictorian of her class and a year later was on her way to Alabama, embarked on an educational adventure which has perhaps no parallel in the world's history.

The story of that adventure, of the deliverance of Helen Keller's fine intelligence from the darkness in which it had been lost, of its development and of nearly fifty years of friendship and shared achievement between the two women, was already one of our great possessions. In the light of the facts told here fully for the first time it takes on an added and poignant significance. Mrs. Braddy's biography restores to us two great figures which were in danger of being submerged in the legend of Helen Keller and her teacher.

MARTHA GRUENING.

Economics Without Recovery

The Economics of Recovery, by Leonard P. Ayres. New York: The Macmillan Company. 189 pages. $1.75.

THIS BOOK, written "in the hope that it may be helpful in the national recovery effort," will—thanks to the respect economists are known to accord the author for his careful computing and neat charting of statistics—be taken up by many intelligent laymen with the same hope. They will lay it down in the knowledge that they have been importuned once more to let recovery come of itself, to reinstate orthodoxy and have a good old-fashioned revival of the sort that is always followed by a good old-fashioned slump.

Colonel Ayres believes that our erring government is off after two loves at once, recovery and reform, with no good to come of either. Perhaps, however, if the helpful intention of this book is realized by those in power, the government will forswear its guilty promiscuity. It will cease trying to prevent bankruptcies, will repeal the Securities Act, so that corporations can float bonds and reëmploy almost everybody, and will thus permit a recovery that already exists almost everywhere else in the world to come to our shores too, automatically. This, at least, is what the author seems to hope; but the reader is not greatly excited, knowing that the let-us-aloners have been shelved by an administration that intends to act.

Here is how the book exposes our problems:

The depression came out of the War; we should not fight again. In the '20s we overexpanded our debts, "mortgaged our future income to present satisfactions, and now the future is here" (page 30); nevertheless (page 114) if we now go back to constructional activities it would aid recovery because money so paid out "is present purchasing power borrowed from the future." If there is a contradiction here, it is probably resolved in that higher realm where economists flourish.

Two things to do about debts would be to scale them down, which is painful, or inflate prices. But inflation thus far merely increases the general price level and "decreases profits and real incomes"; moreover, additional inflation

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

would chiefly benefit stockholders because corporations will pay off their bonds with profits from inflation!

The guarantee of bank deposits should not have been tried because the state of New York tried it a hundred years ago and it failed. Our state banks have been so busy getting ready for deposit guarantee that they have been unable to finance recovery. The upturn (from complete standstill) after the bank holiday was the greatest ever recorded (bringing the index almost back to March, 1932)—hence, "we may well wonder why the measures authorized . . . were put into effect . . . when the business recovery . . . was already under way. . . . Probably the answer is . . . not emergency measures . . . but sweeping reform laws . . . to alter social inequalities."

One reason why the farmer has always been such a difficult person is that he has had to contend with a demand which does not increase when prices fall or decrease when prices rise; but in spite of that, the processing tax will decrease the demand for farm products because it will raise prices. Wages for industrial workers cannot be increased by hour-reductions or high minimum rates because a chart for eighty years back shows that wage rates and the value-of-output-per-worker correlate nicely, and just as nicely with ten million unemployed as with two.

We really do not have a glut of capital goods (despite the overexpansion of the '20s) because much machinery has been allowed to wear out or become obsolete (although balance sheets of durable-goods industries show a lot of unspent cash and depreciation reserves at record highs).

Securities should be sold (damn that Securities Act!) to permit American industry to rehabilitate itself, so that it may produce more goods in order to produce more goods in order. . . . And durable-goods producers must sell bonds (they sold a lot in the '20s, five billions in '27, only two in '31, way down in '33). But the dangers of inflation keep bond-buyers out of the market; the Securities Act prohibits securities, and our machinery for distributing them was destroyed by the new banking legislation.

Of course, we may all live some day under a planned economy, Colonel Ayres concedes, but the bottom of a depression is no place to launch it. "It is blocking the road to recovery [feeding non-producers], and distracting the efforts of government [all wrong anyhow] and the energies of the people from the real and essential task that confronts them [getting out of the depression]."

W. Bayard Taylor.

The Sins of the Statesmen

Fifty Years of Europe, by J. A. Spender. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company. 436 pages. $5.

Mr. Spender gives a broad survey of the diplomacy of Europe from the close of the Franco-Prussian War to the outbreak of the World War. It is an impressive story of the successive steps by which Europe descended into the abyss. He writes from the British point of view, and the only charge he can bring against British statesmanship is that of naïveté. It was naïve of Lord Lansdowne and Sir Eyre Crowe not to realize that by the arrangement with France in 1904, mainly concerning colonial matters, Great Britain was giving her casting vote to the Entente. It was naïve of Sir Edward Grey, "one of the simplest of English statesmen," not to understand that the correspondence with M. Cambon in 1912, about the extent to which Britain was committed to supporting France, was an acknowledgment of such commitment.

Jules Romains'

PASSION'S PILGRIMS

(MEN OF GOOD WILL II)

"This book is denser in incident than a year's file of the *Times*, more exciting than a honeymoon, wittier than all the plays of Mr. Coward taken together, and in intellectual grasp and human sympathy the peer of any Continental work since *The Magic Mountain*."—Clifton Fadiman, in *The New Yorker*. $2.50

•

Josephine

WIFE OF NAPOLEON

BY E. A. RHEINHARDT

"This is, in my opinion, a book of rarer quality than either Ludwig's 'Napoleon' or Zweig's 'Marie Antoinette'. It is free from any taint of conventionality: it is neither hero-worship nor debunking. It reveals sympathy without sentimentality, irony without cynicism. It is not in the least romanced: and yet what a romance it evokes! It refuses to be history: but what a gorgeous background history provides for the slight, pathetic figure of the heroine!"—Albert Guerard, in the *N. Y. Herald Tribune*. $3.00

•

Nobel Prize Winner

Bunin's

THE WELL OF DAYS

The new novel by Ivan Bunin, winner of the Nobel Prize for literature in 1933. It is the story of a youth in old Russia, poignant, nostalgic, infinitely touching. "From the beginning to the end we feel the touch of a true poet and his spiritual oneness with the natural world about him."—*Saturday Review of Literature*. $2.50

AT ALL BOOKSTORES

BORZOI BOOKS **Alfred·A·Knopf·730 Fifth Ave·N·Y.**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Spender apologizes for Grey's reticence in revealing to his own country and the world where England stood, on the ground that such a course would have precipitated the contingency it was designed to avoid. He lays much stress on the belligerent tone of Austro-German conversations in the spring of 1914; and on the fact that in July, when Bethmann-Hollweg was bringing restraining pressure on Berchtold, von Moltke was urging Conrad, the Austrian chief of staff, to mobilize. Diplomacy, which had increasingly relied on the threat of war, found itself unable to withstand military pressure. After a pause in what the Kaiser called "the no-man's land between the military and the political," the initiative passed to the general staffs. Mr. Spender's main thesis is that statesmen failed to realize the collective results of their action in the pre-war crisis, as they have failed to realize the collective results of their actions in the years of economic depression that followed the general bankruptcy of statesmanship.

ROBERT MORSS LOVETT.

Books in Brief

ART

THE GALLERY OF LIVING ART, by A. E. Gallatin. *New York University Press. 74 pages, illustrated. $1.*

The newly published catalogue of the Gallery of Living Art pretends to be nothing more than a guide to New York University's collection of modern pictures; actually it qualifies for more ambitious ends. It may be enjoyed by anyone interested in contemporary esthetic developments, whether he has access to the gallery or not, and should prove rewarding to many who have yet to be confronted with a modern picture. In short, this volume is one of the few intelligently presented expositions of modern art available in this country. The thirty-eight reproductions should alone suffice to demonstrate that a rekindled nobility and substance has emerged with the art of Picasso and Marin and the early Matisse; and a glance will disclose the direction toward which the gallery is pointing. Most apparent, perhaps, is the opposition to impressionism, to effect-painting, to external illustration; also to surrealism and its literary offshoots; the director has concentrated on those painters who express themselves architecturally within the canvas limits. Three essays complete the volume and serve to clarify the varied movements which have carried contemporary painting still farther into the abstract.

SCIENCE

ELECTRICITY, by John Pilley. *New York: Oxford University Press. 362 pages, illustrated. $2.50.*

This new addition to the admirable Clarendon Science Series will be welcomed by that large group of scientifically minded laymen who for years have had to pretend, more or less plausibly, that they understood the ways and means of electricity. Mr. Pilley has performed a very fine job of popularization in a notoriously difficult field. He begins at once with atoms and atomic structure, and proceeds with the subject of electrification, forms of discharge, potentials, magnetism and electro-magnetic phenomena. Numerous illustrations and the use of simple examples assist in making the knowledge tick in the mind, but a great deal more might have been written on radio, wireless telegraphy and television.

THE JUNGLE BEES AND WASPS OF BARRO COLORADO ISLAND, by Phil Rau. *Kirkwood, Missouri: Phil Rau. 324 pages, illustrated. $2.75.*

Professional entomologists will profit most from this comprehensive study of insect life on the largest island in Gatun Lake, Panama Canal Zone. Mr. Rau, an enthusiastic naturalist, is gifted with keen powers of observation, patience and a pleasant style. His copiously illustrated volume describes in orthodox technical details the life habits of some sixty species of native hymenoptera and numerous varieties of spiders, beetles, moths, butterflies and ants. Philosophy rather than science is served in the last chapter on "Mind as a Forerunner of Evolution," in which Mr. Rau develops, with a plausibility that has always excited the mistrust of hardened investigators, the theme (for it can scarcely take rank as a scientific theory) of the "psychic factor in evolution," according to which "the ingredient of mental activity tends to lift a creature out of the necessity of complete physical adaptation."

FICTION

RIVER GOD, by Evans Wall. *New York: The Macaulay Company. $2.50.*

This falls under the general classification of light fiction for circulating libraries. Even though there is more attempt at characterization than in most books of the type, the plot is vastly more important than are the two principal characters, Sand and Ruth. Sand, by mystical implication, is a kinsman of the River God, "a chile of the ribber," whom the treacherous Mississippi cannot harm. He was found as a baby, floating like Moses on the flood. Ruth's grandfather, a rich planter, adopts him and brings him up as his granddaughter's playmate. The reader can guess that a good many obstacles have to be overcome, and temptations undergone, before the two are happily united.

Contributors

HERMAN SIMPSON, formerly editor of The New York Call, has been for many years a student of Marxist theory. He contributed to the recent symposium, "Recovery Through Revolution."

LEWIS MUMFORD, author of books on architecture, art, literature and the social sciences, has contributed frequent technical articles to The Journal of the American Institute of Architects, Architecture and the Architectural Record. His "Technics and Civilization" will be published this spring by Harcourt, Brace.

JOHN GOULD FLETCHER is the author, among other books, of "Parables," "Branches of Adam" and "Black Rock." He contributed to "Miscellany of American Poetry," "The American Caravan" and "Folk-Say."

JOHN DEWEY'S recently completed book on the philosophy of esthetics, "Art as Experience," will be published this spring by Minton, Balch and Company.

T. S. MATTHEWS is literary editor of Time.

MARTHA GRUENING, a frequent contributor to magazines, has made a study of education and educational methods in this country and Europe.

W. BAYARD TAYLOR is associate professor of Finance at the School of Commerce of the University of Wisconsin.

PAYING GUESTS WANTED

Two or three guests will be welcome in refined private home near Asheville, N. C. Steam heat and open fires; old-fashioned Southern cooking. Excellent references. Address: Box 783, The New Republic.

LANGUAGES

SPANISH and FRENCH, simple, direct method; special complete tourist course of 15 private lessons. Literary and commercial translations. Prof. Alvaro de Silva, 8 W. 13th Street, GRamercy, 7-3182.

POSITIONS WANTED

Young Woman with academic and literary background and experience desires research work. Interest primary—salary secondary. Address: Box 808, The New Republic.

Physically strong and healthy young man desires healthier moral and mental atmosphere. Work on farm. Anything. Anywhere. Address: Box 805, The New Republic.

PERSONAL

Thoughtful, companionable, still young woman in her thirties, with diversified interests, feels just now the need for fresh contacts. Address: Box 807, The New Republic.

FOR RENT

Unfurnished: a sunny two-room apartment, steam and fireplace; also a one-room and kitchen apartment with fireplace, in old-fashioned house owned by The New Republic. *Telephone: CHelsea 3-8393.*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED